

JPRS 77280

29 January 1981

# USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1097

**FBIS** FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

29 January 1981

# USSR REPORT

## POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1097

### CONTENTS

#### INTERNATIONAL

Washington's Policies in 1980 Analyzed (Spartak Beglov; NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW, 24 Dec 80).....	1
Sivachev, Yakovlev on U.S.-Soviet Relations (ZHURNALIST, Dec 80).....	4
Medvedko Book Attacks Neocolonialism in Arab Countries (MOSCOW NEWS, 30 Nov-7 Dec 80).....	11
Discussion on Palestinians' Inalienable Rights (V. Kudryavtsev; NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW, 26 Nov 80).....	13
Socialist Scientists on Problems of African Liberation Movement (NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, No 5, 1980).....	16
Primakov Analyzes Common Traits of Developing Countries (Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov; NARODY AZII I AFRIKI, No 5, 1980).....	27

#### REGIONAL

Turkmen Scores U.S. Neocolonialism (N. Yermoshkin; TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA, 13 Dec 80).....	42
Kazakh Journalist on Soviet-Finnish Friendship (Ermeke Serkebaev Interview; SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN, 23 Dec 80).....	47
Tajiks Complain About Living Conditions (R. Khodzhiyev Interview; PRAVDA, 30 Nov 80).....	49
Aspects of Youth Employment Problem in Ukraine (A. Tyutyunnikov; RADIYANS'KA UKRAYINA, 4 Dec 80).....	53

## INTERNATIONAL

### WASHINGTON'S POLICIES IN 1980 ANALYZED

Moscow NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW in English 24 Dec 80 pp 1-3

[Article by APN political correspondent, Spartak Beglov]

[Text] A person beating down in hysterics is an unpleasant sight. Even less pleasure millions of people the world over derived in the past year as they watched the atmosphere of hysterics in which decision-making was done at the main political centres of the West and primarily in Washington.

In January Jimmy Carter "cocked" the American war machine, threatening to pull the trigger in any place where so-called US "vital interests" might be affected. The inglorious US armed provocation against Iran followed in April. No less disgrace America brought upon itself by its boycott of the Moscow Olympics, and US farmers greatly suffered from the embargo on grain sales to the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, the White House indulged in conceiving the inconceivable and there came Directive No. 59 on the admissibility and expediency of a "limited" or "selective" nuclear war. Another directive was given to the American delegation at the Madrid meeting: to get the Europeans to reconcile themselves to the death sentence passed by American "hawks" on detente. During the December NATO Council session US Defense Secretary Harold Brown pounded his fist on the table, demanding that his allies agree to new burdensome arms race expenditures. All this took place against the background of the provocative campaign around Poland unleashed by the same circles.

Now, at the end of the year, it looks as if the outgoing US Administration is all out to tie up the new Administration hand and foot with the heavy legacy of its policy, and also to place the burden of this legacy on the entire world community.

However, the world has an alternative. It has been clearly set out in the decisions adopted at the just concluded 35th session of the UN General Assembly. Significantly, in the current difficult situation representatives of the overwhelming majority of states deemed it necessary to emphasize their support for all the initiatives and proposals submitted by governments remaining loyal to the principles of detente, of curbing the arms race and advocating a peaceful and just solution of urgent problems.



No less significant is the fact that the initiatives of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Treaty members occupy a central place among these proposals. In particular, the USSR and its allies suggested measures to reduce international tension, that states refrain from enlarging the existing military groupings, that a freeze be put on conventional armaments and armed forces from an agreed date, that an international convention on security guarantees for non-nuclear states be signed and so on.

Looking back on the turbulent course of events in the past year, intelligent observers cannot fail to notice that while Washington artificially dramatized developments and whipped up passions, the reaction of Moscow and other East European capitals was invariably opposite in character--calm, well-considered and firm. This was a reaction of reason, profoundly conscious concern and interest in preserving detente and consolidating the positions of all the forces that stand for negotiations and a mutually acceptable solution to pressing issues.

To the "Carter doctrine" containing a threat to use "rapid deployment forces" Moscow responded by proposing a meeting of leaders of states of all the continents to find a common approach to urgent problems and their peaceful solution. In response to Washington's limited nuclear war doctrine, the countries--members of the Warsaw Treaty pact, reaffirmed their readiness to take upon themselves the obligation--provided the NATO states did the same--to conclude a pact on non-aggression and withstanding from being the first in using nuclear weapons one against another. When the unheard-of US naval force concentrated at the northwestern corner of the Indian Ocean, under the pretext of neutralizing the Soviet threat to the oil sources, the Soviet Union put forward a plan of peace and security for the Persian Gulf area, the five points of which made it binding on all the powers to demilitarize that region and guarantee the safe sea routes to the oil fields.

In reply to NATO's provocative action against Poland, which was indicative of Washington's obvious interest in destabilizing the situation in Central Europe, the Warsaw Treaty countries assembled to declare unanimously that for the benefit of detente's priority, the socialist states continued to keep their channels of cooperation with the West open in all the spheres but shall not permit any interference by the foreign forces inimical to socialism in the internal affairs of the community's members.

The last year was sadly marked by Washington's practice of not missing a single chance of sabre-rattling and of never supporting a single peace proposal. One of the most telling examples is Afghanistan whose government initiated in May a simple formula of removing the cause which made it necessary on the eve of 1980 the bringing of the Soviet troop contingent into that country. Should Washington have said "yes" to negotiations between the countries directly concerned, that is, Afghanistan and its neighbours in the East and the West, on guaranteed non-penetration of the Afghan borders by CIA armed hirelings, the undeclared war against the Afghan revolution would have lost its stronghold and with its termination, the purely defensive Soviet action undertaken to meet the Kabul request, too, would have become no more topical.

All the developments in the Middle East and South-West Asia over the recent year have borne out the inference that if there had been no Afghanistan, Washington would have thought of some other pretext to provoke a power rivalry here aimed against Iran and the other countries which have made the choice unsuitable to long-time American interests in the region. The eruption of the Iran-Iraq conflict revealed the sinister danger spilled to the region by the constant injections of the combustibles and the USA's stake on alienating the peoples and spurring them one against another.

Thus the expiring year has stressed that in the context of the militarist hysteria which has swept the American administration, there is little room left in the White House for sound, sober and thought-out political inferences. Nonetheless dangerous is the fact that the out-going US administration makes clear its particular concern for having this hysteria preserved in the White House's Oval office after its departure as well.

The Soviet Union remained undaunted by the bellicose statements--also hopelessly meant to shaken this country's positions of reason--which were so rampant in the United States in the height of the election campaign. Acting from the same positions of reason the Soviet Union and its allies meet the New Year with the invariable readiness and willingness to carry out a fruitful dialogue with all the countries, including the United States, in order to search for realistic and mutually-acceptable ways of consolidating peace and transferring to practicable disarmament measures.

CSO: 1812

## INTERNATIONAL

### SIVACHEV, YAKOVLEV ON U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

Moscow ZHURNALIST in Russian No 12, Dec 80 signed to press 11 Nov 80 pp 66-68

[Soviet scientists interviewed on USSR-U.S. relations: "USSR-United States: History Teaches"]

[Text] ZHURNALIST begins a new column: "Conversations With Scientists." The editorial office believes that readers will be interested in learning the opinion of prominent Soviet and foreign scientists on cardinal problems of the development of our society, the USSR's relations with foreign states and the mutual relations of the press and science.

The column is opened by a conversation with Prof Nikolay Vasil'yevich Sivachev, doctor of historical sciences and head of a department of the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov History Faculty, and Prof Nikolay Nikolayevich Yakovlev, doctor of historical sciences and head of a sector of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Studies. The topic of the conversation is Soviet-American relations and the attitude of the U.S. press on this matter.

The conversation is conducted by Mikhail Chernousov, editor of ZHURNALIST's Foreign Press Department.

Chernousov: Dear guests, I propose making the point of departure of our discussion a book which you wrote at the request of Chicago University Publishers and which came out this year in the United States in a large edition. I would inform our readers that the book is entitled "Russia and the United States. American-Soviet Relations From the Soviet Viewpoint." If I am not mistaken, it is the first time that an original work written specially for the American reader and to an order from an American publisher and not a translation of a Soviet historical work has been published in the United States. It is not surprising that your book has stirred tremendous interest and a barrage of comments in the American press. We shall return to the press comments, but meanwhile a few words, please, about how this book came about.

N. Sivachev: It all began 9 years ago, when the Chicago University Publishers proposed that we take part in the series "The United States and the World: Through the

Eyes of Foreigners." Negotiations with the publishers and technical difficulties--the translation, the journeys of the MS, the proofs and the collation between Chicago and Moscow and the work pace of the university publisher--all this delayed the book's appearance. However, that is all behind us now, and the work of 300 pages with a foreword by Academician R. Khokhlov has been published in the United States. We would like to thank the publishers for the work they did.

N. Yakovlev: To be honest, part of the blame for the delay is mine. It took a great deal of effort on the part of Professor Sivachev, who visits the United States often and is therefore conversant with the concerns of American historians and the interests of the reading public, to convince me of the need for conveying to Americans the Soviet viewpoint in English. I believed that there were sufficient people among the Americans interested in this problem who knew Russian. After all, specialists here in the field of foreign history know foreign languages. I was, it turns out, mistaken. The competent American expert D. Geddes recently remarked in connection with the publication of our book: the opportunities for American readers to familiarize themselves with the works of Soviet authors are very limited inasmuch as Soviet studies are translated infrequently, and it is rare for Americans to study Russian. A pity. But pardon me, colleagues, I interrupted.

N. Sivachev: We decided from the outset to write the book as if we were preparing it for the Soviet reader. I said in an interview with the NEW YORK TIMES that we did not intend to ingratiate ourselves with the American reader, indeed, the Chicago University Publishers did not ask for this. It advised us to put forward our views freely. I believe it would have been unfair to the American reader to have written differently for the Soviet and American editions. I would like to mention that the publishers did not change a single comma in the book.

The division of labor between us was such: I studied the period from the end of the 18th century through 1 September 1939, and Professor Yakovlev studied the period from the start of WWII through the time of the book's publication.

Chernousov: Many of the Western press comments on your book repeat the same thought: the authors wrote their work under dictation. I have seen the suggestion in some American publications that the book was written...in the USSR Foreign Ministry. The British journal INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS attributes authorship to the "Soviet censor," and the American NATIONAL REVIEW believes that the book bears the "seal of the Kremlin." The London anticommunist quarterly SURVEY even carried something like a musical comedy about how some higher authorities devise the wording for Sivachev and Yakovlev. The finale of this comedy review has one executive congratulating the other: "I don't know how you got on with these frivolous intellectuals but I appreciate your patience and ability to stay awake...."

N. Yakovlev: These conjectures are made in the Western press for provocative purposes or owing to incomprehension or feeble-mindedness. The purpose of the Western press's fabrications is to instill in the reader the idea that Soviet scientists are either robotized servants of an "authority" or frivolous intellectuals who have to be watched constantly. Alas, the West simply cannot see that nobody is pulling our strings and that we write as our conscience as scientists commands and take an objective analysis of events as a basis.



Chernousov: The Western press's mass indoctrination of minds does its work. But to return to the book. To what did you pay particular attention in the history of relations between the two countries in the light of their present state?

N. Sivachev: We emphasized in the book a number of points to which American historiography pays no attention, as a rule.

First, Washington understands mutual advantage and equality in relations with Moscow as a position wherein it must unfailingly wheedle out of the partner for itself some extra benefits. Maybe not very big ones at times, but nevertheless benefits about which plenty of noise can be made. It is argued thus here: it is easy for you Russians, you are a monolithic country, and once your representative has come to an agreement with us on something or other, there are no problems in, say, ratifying the agreement for you. But we are a "democracy" and we have to sell the treaty as a commodity to the public, and the latter will not buy it without it having the force of victory. At a pinch—a victory trinket.

Back in 1933, when talks were being held on the restoration of diplomatic relations between the two countries, Washington was looking for such concessions from Moscow for domestic American political consumption. It endeavored to at least show that it had achieved some concessions from the Russians. And Franklin Roosevelt was far from the last American President who needed this and who turned hastily constructed diplomatic "victories" into a means of political struggle within the country.

With the passage of time this principle has become a finely developed procedure and a means of considered pressure on the USSR. If Moscow wishes to come to some agreement with us on something or other, they say, let it cede us something in advance. This principle operates not only in insignificant matters but also in questions of global significance. An example of this is the SALT Treaty. The American propaganda machine urges on such bidding and speculation to the utmost. In other words, market behavior with all its consequences.

N. Yakovlev: It was displayed both in respect to the Soviet-American talks in 1933 in Washington's mercenary approach to them and in how the United States subsequently broke the "gentlemen's agreement" reached between Roosevelt and Litvinov on the question of U.S. financial claims against the USSR.

N. Sivachev: Here we come to another feature of Soviet-American relations which we endeavored to emphasize: the unreliability of the United States as a partner and Washington's failure to observe understandings that have been reached.

The American reader, radio listener and television viewer is accustomed to the idea --propaganda has not been unsuccessful in forcing this into him--that all the minuses in Soviet-American relations are engendered by "Moscow's intrigues" and that they are nothing to do with Washington. Yet the entire history of the two countries' relations indicates that it is precisely the United States which is an unreliable partner with whom it is very difficult to do business. There is a multitude of examples of this. From Washington's rupture of the 1933 accords as early as 1935 through the story of the SALT II Treaty in the present. From the frustration of attempts to organize a collective security system in the Pacific and in Europe before the war through the 1972 agreement on the principles of a future trade treaty with

the USSR, when the R. Nixon administration undertook to include therein a clause on most-favored-nation status. It all ended, as you will recall, with an amendment to the Trade Act in which the interests of the rich merchant with limited imagination gain the ascendancy over political commonsense.

Chernousov: It seems to me that it is worth dwelling on the extent to which the U.S. administration is subject to influence within the United States. This influence is exerted not least through the press.

N. Sivachev: The U.S. Government is indeed subject to the influence of various circles of monopoly capital and the Zionists. The latter's role can be clearly traced over many decades. I will give one example.

The first trade treaty between Russia and the United States was concluded in 1832. It was mutually beneficial, although, I would note, the Americans strove for its conclusion more than the Russians. A campaign was raised against the treaty at the start of the 20th century whose driving force were the leaders of American Zionism. Even then Zionists represented an impressive force in the United States. They were guided by the principle that everything that is good for the Zionists is also good for the country in which they reside. They opposed Russian-American trade in order to strengthen their positions in the United States and Europe.

Superficially this appeared to be a struggle against tsarist despotism—broad strata of the population could easily be attracted to the camp of its opponents. Inasmuch as the interests of the leaders of the American Zionists concurred with the expansionist aspirations of U.S. imperialism, which had run up against Russian counteraction, Washington saw this as a powerful combination of forces which had to be reckoned with. As a result the Zionists achieved cancellation of the Russian-American trade treaty. The loss, however, was sustained by the United States—this was soon apparent to the Americans themselves.

Are we not seeing the same today also, when manifestly profitable economic deals with the USSR are slipping from the Americans' hands often merely because Washington is forced to reckon with the "particular" attitude of the Zionists toward the USSR?

Chernousov: The history of the relations of the two countries provides sufficient examples of the fact that Washington officials are unreliable partners who at every step break the commitments they have assumed. But what is significant is this: on each occasion the U.S. Administration and American propaganda explain the breakdown of accords by the "democratic essence" of domestic political life in the United States. What can you say on this score?

N. Sivachev: Poor American democracy! What is not shifted off onto it! Like any other country with which the United States concludes a treaty, the Soviet Union is by no means obliged to admire the "democratic" method of arriving at a final decision. Ultimately the Congress, the Judiciary and the Administration are the sole system of government on whose behalf the president enters into official relations with other countries. Strictly speaking, it is not our business how U.S. policy is shaped in relation to the USSR. What is important to the Soviet Union is something else: to enter into negotiations with plenipotentiary representatives of the United States and deal responsibly, proceeding from the fact that the U.S. representative is thus empowered and acts accordingly.

Chernousov: Let us return to the history of Soviet-American relations and to your book. I now address Professor Yakovlev, who studied in it the period from the start of WWII through the present. Nikolay Nikolayevich, the war years are a striking example of the cooperation of the two countries and an example of realized and missed opportunities for cooperation and of the consistency of the USSR's foreign policy and of that same inconsistency and unreliability of U.S. policy. What did you wish to convey to the American reader as you analyzed the events of those years?

N. Yakovlev: The true story. In the United States, it seems to me, historians confess the ingenuous faith of whoever controls the past controls the future and whoever has a hold on the present controls the past. With reference to your question this means that the history of 1941-1945 is adapted to the needs of Washington's current policy. Since the sources of the postwar development of events in the world lie precisely in the war years, bitter moaning is heard in the United States: out of naivete the Americans, they say, ceded in the fever of the armed struggle its political aspects, and this allegedly contributed to the immeasurable growth of the might of the USSR.

We are aware of this proposition of American propaganda and American historians. Therefore it is important to show in the book Washington's true strategy as seen by Soviet historians. Yes, we were allies, but made a different contribution to the victory. Some 20 million of our compatriots gave their lives and 400,000 Americans died in crushing the fascist Axis powers. One American perished for every 50 in the Soviet Union. The material costs of the war at the prevailing rate of exchange were \$485 billion for the USSR, \$330 billion for the United States. I believe that it proved perfectly realistic to describe the different contribution to the victory and the different approach to allied commitments, particularly in the example of the delay in opening a second front.

As Prof W. Williams, chairman of the American Historians Organization, observed in his review, the book provides "complex and subtle dialectical reasoning: Western capitalism (led by Roosevelt) wished to beat the Axis powers at minimum cost to itself. The book goes on to provide a subtle criticism of Roosevelt, Churchill and others. The West was successful--it avoided big losses and emerged the victors together with the USSR.... So we approach the consequences of the fact that we ourselves allowed the Russians to smash Germany. Brilliantly told. We preferred fewer losses and more butter, but awoke and discovered that capitalism was on the defensive and that our dreams of preserving the 19th century were dashed." If we disregard the excessive directness and extravagance of style, Professor Williams has correctly understood what is said in the book.

Chernousov: I read with particular interest in your work about the genesis of the "cold war"--the "Truman doctrine"--and all that accompanied it. Analogies involuntarily suggest themselves between the actions of the J. Carter and H. Truman administrations. Although you completed the book in 1978, when not everything was then quite clear in Washington's present policy, could parallels have been traced even then between the policies of these two administrations?

N. Yakovlev: Undoubtedly. American foreign policy theorists are still arguing about the essence of the idea of "containing communism" advanced by the diplomat



and political scientist George Kennan and made the basis of the policy of President Harry Solomon (sic) Truman with respect to the Soviet Union. The elderly G. Kennan has been repeating over and over for many years now that at that time he was "misunderstood," as having imparted to "containment" a purely military character--the creation of NATO, the arms race and so forth. But he allegedly meant something else: subjecting the USSR to all-around pressure "from a position of strength," striving for a change of our system from within. And he even indicated the period when this would happen--in 10-15 years.

I believe that the provocative campaign "in defense of human rights" is entirely attributable to the doctrine of "containment," as its very author--George Kennan--suggests that it be understood. This prompted us in the epilog to express ourselves unequivocally apropos the unattractive venture of J. Carter and his entourage and point out that inevitable bankruptcy awaits this campaign and that no illusions should be harbored on this score.

The racket surrounding "human rights" which has been kicked up in the United States, as also the doctrine of "exhausting" the USSR--attempting to ruin our country on the paths of the arms race--presupposes subverting the USSR from within. And this is the common property of the "containment" doctrine, from Truman through Carter.

Chernousov: I believe that the frankness with which the book is written has evoked, together with enthusiastic comments, irritation in the American press. The influential BOSTON GLOBE wrote, for example, that Sivachev and Yakovlev suffer from a "lack of generosity" by refusing to share equally the blame for the poor relations between the USSR and the United States. The STRATEGIC REVIEW "denounced" the authors in the following words: "The book, which was certainly written in the interests of detente, leaves no doubt that it is a question of the Soviet model of detente. It is pointed out again and again that good relations can only be developed between the United States and the USSR if the United States adopts the Soviet viewpoint and bows to the objective reality of Soviet might." And, finally, the well-known historian Prof A. Schlesinger called your book "outrageous" in the NEW YORK REVIEW OF BOOKS.

N. Yakovlev: I will begin with the final point--Prof A. Schlesinger's remark. It was not much of a surprise to me. This historian with a claim to official talents, who served as an advisor to President J. Kennedy, interrupting his work on the commercial book production line, decided to respond to our book in a huge article. I believe that the venerable intellectual proved to have been forever morally poisoned by the years of work in his youth in U.S. intelligence--the Office of Strategic Services. For him the mere publication of a book by Soviet historians in the United States could not have failed to have appeared "outrageous."

As far as the comment in STRATEGIC REVIEW, the main oasis of wisdom of the Republicans, is concerned, the journal has hit the nail on the head: we do indeed assert that it is essential to take heed of objective realities, even if these realities--Soviet might, for example--are unacceptable for many people in the United States. The book is indeed written in the interests of detente, but it would be idle for the journal to expect that we would write it in the interests of a detente of an "American model."

And about the BOSTON GLOBE article. By what way is it possible to "share equally" the blame for American intervention in Soviet Russia in 1918-1920, for the 16 years of Washington's nonrecognition of Moscow, for the delays in the opening of a second front, the 1946 atomic tests, the trade blockade, the "cold war" and the entire cascade of imperialist doctrines and directives, right up to Directive 59 issued by J. Carter?

History at least teaches what should not be done and what must be avoided. We must primarily avoid an arms race and instead of accusations and counteraccusations learn a more constructive language. May no more of the opportunities cast to the wind in the recent past be let slip in our time. It is obvious that our great countries bear too huge a responsibility in international relations to allow utterly unscrupulous irresponsible forces to distract them from the accomplishment of truly historic tasks.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Zhurnalist", 1980

8850

CSO: 1807

## INTERNATIONAL

### MEDVEDKO BOOK ATTACKS NEOCOLONIALISM IN ARAB COUNTRIES

Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 47, 30 Nov-7 Dec 80 p 9

[Text] "East and West of Suez" is a new publication from Politizdat Publishers by journalist and oriental studies expert Leonid Medvedko. Described are the hidden sources of the many wars and acts of armed intervention, bloody revolts and coup d'etats, secret political deals and oil diplomacy—the evolution of the ways and means which imperialism has used in its battle against the national liberation movement and social revolutions in the Arab East for the past quarter century.

MOSCOW NEWS spoke to Medvedko about his book.

Question: Do you use "Suez" as a geographical or a political notion?

Answer: Both. "Suez" produces numerous contradictory associations. The canal is more than simply a geographical boundary dividing the Asian and African parts of the Arab world. It was long one of the important, if not the most important, communications for oil and military colonialism.

This is why the nationalization of the Suez Canal in 1956 led to a crisis which culminated in the tripartite aggression against Egypt. In this respect, Suez is also a chronological milestone.

Question: What exactly are you alluding to?

Answer: Well, to be strictly scientific, it is impossible to give the exact date of the death of colonialism and the birth of neo-colonialism. They are inter-related. Nevertheless, the fact that both of these forms of domination are doomed becomes potently obvious whenever history makes a sharp turn. The 1956 Suez crisis is this type of landmark. It signalled the decline of colonialism—not only in the Arab East but beyond. When the anti-monarchic and anti-imperialist revolution erupted in Iran, Western journalists had good reason to call it, as they did, "another Suez." The overthrow of the shah in Iran is also a clear signal of the beginning of the decline of neo-colonialism.

Question: But isn't this conclusion premature? Today "Suez" might give rise to totally different associations. Egypt was once a bastion of anti-imperialist struggle and an active member of the anti-Israel coalition in the

Arab world--now it is an ally of the United States and Israel, and a watchdog lying in wait for any signal of liberation revolutions in the Middle East and in Africa. Foreign military bases have again been established on the banks of the Suez Canal. The military presence of the United States and of certain other Western powers is being entrenched in the Arab East under the pretext of guaranteeing the "Camp David peace" or "protection" of oil communications. Does this not indicate a certain revival of military colonialism?

Answer: No, it would be more proper to call this a "relapse into colonialism." Current developments make this clear. Essentially, what we are seeing is the return to the bankrupt methods the colonialists once used.

The Carter doctrine which signals a reorientation from the economic method of influence characteristic of neo-colonialism to the preparation of armed aggression is very definite evidence of the profound crisis of the entire neo-colonialist system.

Question: But neo-colonialism is still considered to have quite a strong footing in the spheres of ideology and the economy. Can we speak about an extension of the crisis to these spheres?

Answer: We certainly can. The Iranian revolution is a good example here again. It essentially marked the rejection of not only a definite neo-colonialist model of economic development, but of the ideology of the capitalist West as well.

Question: Certain sections of your book, specifically those dealing with the behind-the-scenes aspects of the October war of 1973, originally carried in periodicals, have sparked great interest and lots of discussion. Is it correct to say that the October war of 1973 paved the road to the "Camp David peace?"

Answer: The October war of 1973 led to contradictory results. On the one hand, because of the military successes of the Arab countries supported by the Soviet Union, it led to some positive developments in the political settlement of the conflict that were achieved at the Geneva Conference. On the other hand, these favourable opportunities were not taken advantage of, owing to Tel Aviv's sabotage and the reorientation of Cairo's policy. This in the long run paved the road to the "Camp David peace."

Question: How would you phrase the main conclusion of your study?

Answer: The contradictory political associations produced by the geographical name of Suez reflect the objective and complex process of anti-imperialist liberation revolution in the Arab East. This process and its related turbulent developments are accompanied by the ups and downs of the Arab liberation movement, the announced "departure" of colonialism from the areas east of Suez, and the attempts to revive it there under a new image. But colonialism is doomed, and the victory of the liberation revolutions is something that cannot be stopped.

## INTERNATIONAL

### DISCUSSION ON PALESTINIANS' INALIENABLE RIGHTS

Moscow NOVOSTI DAILY REVIEW in English 26 Nov 80 pp 1-4

[Article by IZVESTIYA political commentator V. Kudryavtsev]

[Text] The Palestinian problem is an international problem, and all the nations in the world, let alone those in the Middle East have an objective interest in having it settled in the national interests of the Arab people of Palestine.

The exercise by the Arab people of Palestine of their inalienable rights, to the point of establishing an independent state, is unthinkable without the elimination of the consequences of the Israeli aggression of 1967 and all subsequent years.

Only when the troops of the aggressor are completely withdrawn from the occupied Arab lands and an independent Palestinian state is established will it be possible to talk about a lasting and just peace in the Middle East with proper guarantees for the inviolability of the borders of all the Middle East states.

In this way the Palestinians are struggling not only for their national rights but also for the interests of all Arab countries striving to strengthen their security and independence which are threatened by the imperialist hegemons and their allies, Israel's ruling circles. The Palestinians are struggling for the suppression of the dangerous seat of war in the Middle East and therefore for the interests of all peaceloving countries.

It is in the appraisal of the Palestinian movement and its objectives that peace champions and war mongers differ. But even the latter can no longer overlook the Palestinian problem. The enemies of peace, however, are trying to find such ways to "settle" it as would help establish their hegemony in the Middle East. This approach is well illustrated by the Camp David Accords. Camp David is doomed precisely because it embodies an insoluble contradiction between the subjective ambitions of the US imperialists in the Middle East and the objective realities, which include, in particular, the need to settle the Palestinian problem. Small wonder that it was that problem that proved to be a stumbling block for the architects of the



Camp David agreement. Unable to bypass it, they began talking about the so-called "administrative autonomy for the Palestinians." All timetables for its establishment have expired, however, but no progress has been made.

Indeed, the US, which would not recognize the PLO or have anything to do with it, nevertheless cannot escape the problem which is persisting regardless of whether Washington likes the Palestine Liberation Organisation or not. The "autonomy," the US believes, should rely on the vacillating elements in the Palestinian movement, on those who would believe that this "autonomy" is just the beginning of the road to independence. So an attempt was made to split the movement and to discredit Palestinian leaders. A slander campaign representing the PLO as a "terrorist" organisation has again been stepped up in the US.

But all this only reflects the bankruptcy of the US position, which shows itself not only in Mideastern affairs. Hence the spite, which interferes even more strongly with a realistic appreciation of the situation taking shape in the Middle East. It is hardly possible to conceal from the world public that it is none other than Tel Aviv, to which both the old and the newly-elected US Administration promise loyalty, that is pursuing a terrorist policy towards the Palestinian Arabs. Has the US tried to bridle its arrogant ally and condemned its activities as overt terror against a whole people?

Feet-dragging on the solution of the autonomy question suits Israel full well. It entered into talks with Egypt because it could not altogether ignore the existence of this objective problem, although it knew in advance that even a docked autonomy was out of the question. Tel Aviv did not want it at all. The Israeli ruling circles decided to use the breathing space to prepare the ground for the full-scale annexation of the West Bank of the Jordan River and the Gaza Strip (following the accomplished annexation of Jerusalem and the annexation of the Golan Heights that is being prepared now). In particular, this is being done by changing demographic realities through setting up Israeli paramilitary settlements on the occupied lands.

As for Egypt, its attitude to the Palestinian problem also shows that Sadat is not in a position to fully ignore the problem but is demagogically trying to pose as a "champion" of Palestinian interests. However, no one believes him any longer. The position of the Cairo ruling circles with regard to the Palestinian problem is exposed by the increasing subservience of the Cairo administration to the US (lease of military bases, accommodation of the US "rapid deployment force" on Egyptian territory, readiness to use Egyptian troops against the countries opposed to the hegemonistic schemes of US imperialism).

The Palestinian issue and the approach to it are not only a sort of acid test, objectively defining this or that country's stand on the Middle East affairs, but also serve to expose the hypocrisy of the circles which, while admitting the existence of a Palestinian problem, are intent on settling it in such a way so that it does not prevent the imperialist monopolies from imposing their control over the Middle East zone.

We believe that this assessment equally applies to the stand of certain West European circles, including some of the leaders of the social democratic movement. On the one hand they disagree with many aspects of the US Middle East policy, since they understand that any further deterioration of the situation in the area will primarily affect Western Europe, which largely depends on Middle East oil. They understand that the Palestinian problem has not been taken off the wall by the PLO, but is a real and objective one. That is why it must be settled, for it will be impossible to assure peace in the Middle East otherwise. However, as soon as the question of the establishment of an independent Palestinian state is picked up, they tend to confine themselves to verbal overtures about the rights of the Palestinian people. As follows from the emerging set-up, some West European Social Democrats contemplate the chance of a compromise on the Palestinian issue, which ostensibly could be secured through relying on the "obsolete" and unpromising elements in the Palestinian movement. In other words, if one is to make an objective assessment of this position, these elements may serve as a sort of shock-absorber for American imperialism which, in their view, is engaged in two risky a game in the Middle East, fraught with an eventual collapse of imperialist interests in this part of the world.

This stand does not meet the true interests of Western Europe to the appropriate extent either. The latter are reduced to the fact that there can be no peace in the Middle East without the support of the Palestinians' movement to the limit, including their right to set up a national state and return to their lands. Otherwise, the Middle East will remain a dangerous seat of war. Many circles in Western Europe are beginning to understand this, and their appraisal of the role of the Palestine Liberation Organisation both in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world gets increasingly objective. This can be surmised from the fact that the number of PLO representations in capitalist countries gets progressively larger.

The stand by such a reputable international organization as the UN testifies to the same effect. It is appropriate to recall what was said with respect to the Middle East in the resolutions of the 33rd session of the UN General Assembly: until the people of Palestine gain and start exercising their legitimate national rights, a general durable and just peace in the Middle East, with all countries and nations of the region being able to live in peace and safety within recognized and safe boundaries, will not be achieved. Along with the Palestinians' right to form an independent state, the UN also acknowledged their right to return to their native lands.

The Soviet Union has always supported the noble struggle of the Arab people of Palestine for their inalienable national rights up to the establishment of a sovereign state. It stands for the eradication of all consequences of the 1967 Israeli aggression.

Another point that needs emphasizing is that in its struggle the Palestine Liberation Organization acts as an organic part of the Arab national liberation movement. The PLO's objectives totally coincide with the goals of the struggle for peace in the whole world. The organization deserves full and unconditional support by all peace-loving forces of the planet.



## INTERNATIONAL

### SOCIALIST SCIENTISTS ON PROBLEMS OF AFRICAN LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Moscow NARODY AZII I AFRIKI in Russian No 3, 1980 signed to press 1 Oct 80 pp 169-179

[A.M. Pegushev report on Leipzig Symposium on liberation movement in Africa]

[Report] The third symposium of Africanist historians of the socialist countries "History of the National Liberation Movement in Africa: the Problem of Leadership (Formulation of the Question and Individual Studies)" and the fourth session of the work group "History of Africa and the National Liberation Movement in Africa" (which was set up in 1973 within the framework of the problem commission of the multilateral cooperation of the socialist countries' academies of sciences "Economics and Politics of the Developing Countries") took place in September 1979 in Leipzig (GDR).

It is not the first time that the history and problems of the national liberation movement in Africa have been the object of the research of Marxist historians and the subject of discussion at international conferences of Africanists of the socialist countries.<sup>1</sup> But now tasks are being put on the agenda, including the more in-depth study of the social-class composition, driving forces and leadership of the African national liberation movement and the evolution of its development from the time of the first local, unconnected and predominantly spontaneous demonstrations against foreign invasion through our day, when the national liberation movement in Africa has become an inalienable part of the world revolutionary process. Scientists from Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR and Czechoslovakia participated in the symposium and the sessions of the work group, which discussed questions of cooperation and coordination of the activity of the socialist countries' Africanist historians. Soviet Africanists were represented at the symposium by N.A. Ksenofontova (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Africa), A.M. Pegushev (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of General History) and I.I. Pilatova ([ISSA] attached to the Moscow State University).<sup>2</sup>

The welcoming remarks to the participants in the symposium were addressed at the behest of its organizers--the GDR Central Council for the Study of Asia, Africa and Latin America and the African and Near East Studies Section of the K. Marx University in Leipzig--by M. Vogt, the leader of this section. Some 14 papers and reports were then heard and discussed.

The two principal papers--"Leadership of the National Liberation Movement in Africa: Formulation of the Question" (A.M. Pegushev) and "History of the National Liberation

Movement in Africa: Problems of Leadership. Certain Theoretical-Methodological and Historical Aspects" (T. Buettner, GDR)--examined general questions of the methodology and procedure of study of the subject in question, described the social-class types of leadership of the national liberation movement in Africa and illustrated the social-psychological aspects of the problem of the interconnections between the anticolonial leaders and the masses under African conditions.

Marxist historians, as is known, understand by leadership of the national liberation movement the social-class forces at the head of the movement and their political vanguard (party, organization, group and so forth), which organizes and directs this movement and formulates its ideology and program and goals and concrete tasks. Drawing attention in this connection to the correlation of the "guidance" and "leadership" concepts, A.M. Pegushev observed that the distinction between them, which is not that important in itself, assumes a fundamental nature when it is a question of two opposite--Marxist and bourgeois--methodological approaches to the history of the national liberation struggle. An obvious tendency can be traced in bourgeois African studies to reduce the problem under discussion to the narrower issue of leadership (personal, group, political, ethnic and so forth) viewed predominantly in the sociological plane in connection with (or on the basis of) the theory of elites, which, as is known, is methodologically opposed to the Marxist theory of classes.

The report also examined the basic trends or types of leadership of the national liberation struggle: feudal-aristocratic, which predominated in anticolonial leadership in the pre-imperialist era and in the period of the inception of imperialism's colonial system; national bourgeois, which became most prevalent in the period between the two world wars; petit bourgeois, which has been most typical of mass national liberation movements in Africa since WWII; and proletarian, which is beginning to exert an ever increasing influence on the course of contemporary national liberation movements. These are the most typical sociopolitical trends or types of leadership; they may coexist or be interwoven within the framework of one or several historical periods and are manifested as the first throughout the history of the national liberation struggle or as the second since the end of the 19th century through the present.<sup>3</sup>

The speaker devoted his main attention to the feudal-aristocratic and petit bourgeois types of anticolonial leadership. Upon an analysis of the first of them a certain discrepancy can be traced between the historically progressive directivity of the early African anticolonial demonstrations and the subjective goals of a number of its leaders--feudal rulers, tribal leaders, traditional religious leaders and so forth, who frequently struggled for the preservation or restoration of traditional social relations and systems of power, often despotic. Two approaches have been discerned in non-Marxist historiography to an evaluation of such leaders: one is represented by those bourgeois Africanists who, attempting to rehabilitate colonialism historically, deliberately hyperbolize the conservative feature in the activity of these leaders;<sup>4</sup> the other approach is most marked in the work of certain, predominantly African, historians who are inclined to connect the conception of African nationalism with the first anticolonial armed demonstrations and to regard the organizers of these demonstrations as the "true nationalists."<sup>5</sup> The tendentiousness and groundlessness of the first of the approaches described above are obvious. The second, although concealing a certain danger of the idealization

of the first African anticolonial organizers, merits attention and verification in new concrete research. As a whole, however, the process of the conception and inception of nationalism as an ideology and social-political current corresponds more to the conception of national and political self-awareness and the appearance of new forms of social-political activity (parties, newspapers and so forth), that is, with the emergence of the bourgeois-nationalist trend in anticolonial African leadership.

The creation of a mass base of the African national liberation movement is connected with the active entry of the petit bourgeois strata into the anticolonial struggle after WWII. In contrast with the bourgeois nationalists, who advocated predominantly nonviolent, peaceful forms and methods of struggle (petitional, parliamentary and so forth), the representatives of these strata inserted the idea of decisive mass actions in anticolonial leadership. The organizational potential of the petit bourgeois strata and their capacity for active interaction with the peasantry and working class were demonstrated in the course of the anticolonial uprisings on Madagascar (1947-1949) and in Kenya (1952-1956) and Cameroon (1955-1962) and the national liberation revolutions in Algeria, Guinea-Bissau, Angola and Mozambique. These and certain other armed demonstrations also showed the capacity of the African peasantry not only for operating successfully under the leadership of an anticolonial vanguard but also for influencing the formation of its political program and putting forward capable military and political leaders from its ranks. Despite the eclecticism and instability of the ideological-political positions of the petit bourgeois strata and the presence in their midst of contradictory ideological and political trends, they are an important social resource of revolutionary democracy in Africa.

The paper also examined the question of the evolution of the role of anticolonial leaders of the messianic and charismatic type in different periods of the anticolonial struggle.

Keeping to the periodization of the history of national liberation movements generally accepted in Marxist literature, T. Buettner concentrated her main attention on a description of the first two stages or phases of the development of this process in Africa: the anticolonial struggle in the period prior to the Great October Revolution and the national liberation movements between the two world wars.

These periods, like the entire history of the national liberation struggle, provide numerous examples of the activity of outstanding and influential figures, groups of leaders and organizations which were aware of the objective conditions, possibilities and problems, enjoyed the support of the politically active part of the masses and influenced the course of history. Taking as a basis the results of her research into the history of early anticolonial movements in Africa,<sup>6</sup> T. Buettner examined the socioeconomic, ideological and political factors influencing the course of the struggle against colonial usurpers and the aims and forms of the activity of the leaders of this struggle. She puts, among other things, the level of social development of African precolonial societies (scattered village communes, tribes, centralized tribal associations and feudal and semifeudal states) in the category of most important factors.



The paper observed that right up to the 20th century the anticolonial struggle was, as a whole, of the nature of relatively spontaneous and isolated defensive operations and resistance controlled mainly by tribal, feudal and semifeudal forces. A comparative analysis of these movements shows that the most significant and prolonged resistance to the colonial usurpers was offered by the centralized states and large tribal associations (the Mahdists in Sudan, the rulers of the [Ful'be] and Tukulor in West Africa, the Zulu, Matabele and Ashanti tribal associations, the feudal rulers of Ethiopia and so forth). Many leaders of the early anticolonial struggle displayed outstanding organizing and military talent (Samori, for example). But their historical role was often diminished owing to an endeavor to retain power at any price and restore the old tribal systems, which impeded the progressive development of the anticolonial movement. The key positions in the early anticolonial movements were frequently occupied by ambitious representatives of the tribal aristocracy and feudal ruling clique and only since the start of the 20th century by representatives of the new social strata, who attempted to break the fetters of tribal narrow-mindedness. Numerous anticolonial uprisings and demonstrations at this time arose on the basis of the militant Mahdist and messianic movements (in the Islamized countries of the continent) or syncretic Christian and animist messianic movements. Primarily social conditions and also concepts of traditional conservative power and ideology were an obstacle to successful military and political resistance.

Then turning to the period of the inception of the colonial system (from the start of the 20th century through 1917), T. Buettner observed that the forms, aims, driving forces and leadership of the anticolonial struggle at this time became more diverse. New features were, among others, the spread and strengthening of peasant movements in many parts of the continent and attempts at organized joint actions (in the former German colonies, for example) and also the appearance in the arena of new social groups and strata employing peaceful means and methods of struggle. The activity of the representatives of these new forces which had begun quite early, back in the latter half of the 19th century in certain parts of the continent, in West Africa, for example, was aimed mainly at gaining political and cultural positions in colonial institutions and reforms of the colonial system; these "proto-nationalists" were not yet advancing the goal of political self-determination.

Speaking of the qualitative changes in the African anticolonial movement since 1917, T. Buettner drew attention to the growth of the working class. By virtue of specific socioeconomic conditions, the African worker and trade union movement emerged and developed as an integral part of the mass anticolonial movement headed by political parties and organizations. But the influence of the working class, which employed specific proletarian methods of struggle and forms of organization, constantly grew and had achieved an appreciable range at the final stage of the struggle for independence. This was also reflected in the activity of the anticolonial leadership, which was formed mainly from representatives of the intelligentsia and the national bourgeoisie. Many African political, cultural and ethnic organizations of the inter-war period became a school for future leaders of the mass national liberation movement. The pan-African movement, which originally emerged outside of Africa, was an important stimulus thereof.

T. Buettner described the ideology of nationalism as a specific form of anticolonial ideology whose appearance accelerated the formation of united anticolonial

fronts in different countries of the continent and contributed to the struggle against imperialism and tribal and feudal alienation.

Dwelling in conclusion on the role of individual leaders or groups of leaders in the national liberation movement, T. Buettner observed that, as a whole, it was more significant at the initial, organizational stages of the process of the politicization of this movement (the creation of political parties, the first large-scale mass anticolonial actions and campaigns and so forth) than in subsequent periods. The bourgeois and petit bourgeois nationalists took advantage of the messianic features and personal capabilities of individual leaders in their organizational-political activity.

Both principal papers engendered animated discussion. C. Maehrdel, G. Staecker and A. Rueger (all from the GDR) concentrated their attention on such fundamental questions as a typology of leadership, the social-class content of the national liberation struggle, the mutual relations of and interconnection between the anticolonial leaders and the masses, the role of ethnic and national factors in the African liberation movements and so forth. Proposals were expressed that the typology reflect the internal heterogeneousness of the distinguished trends of leadership, particularly the existence of national-reformist and national-revolutionary currents in bourgeois and petit bourgeois leadership, and that particular attention be paid to the question of the role of the peasantry inasmuch as at all stages of the national liberation movement it has not only been the main social-class force numerically but has also influenced to a considerable extent the content and forms of the activity of the anticolonial leadership. The need was also emphasized for a concrete historical approach to questions of the interconnection between the leaders and the masses and of the role of so-called charismatic leaders.

The speeches of G. Staecker, A. Rueger, D. Ernst and G. Weinberger (all from the GDR) and M. Tymowski (Poland) raised the question of the historical significance of the early anticolonial demonstrations in Africa. As a whole, they were described as positive, progressive phenomena in African history. At the same time there was emphasis of the differences which existed between armed struggle against foreign invasion on the one hand and demonstrations pointed directly against the colonial regimes on the other; D. Ernst and M. Tymowski believe that the anticolonial struggle in the full sense of this word only begins after the establishment of the latter.

In the course of the debate mention was made of the need to take account of the extent to which the early anticolonial movements corresponded to the objective historical tasks of their time. Attention was drawn in this connection to the method of analysis employed by K. Marx and F. Engels in the evaluation of the 1846 Krakow uprising and, in particular, to the fact that the conclusion of K. Marx and F. Engels concerning the close interconnection of the question of Poland's political emancipation with the social question<sup>7</sup> was based on a thorough consideration of the objective tasks of this country's development in different historical periods. This approach makes it possible to determine more precisely the historical significance of the early anticolonial movements while not minimizing the subjective goals of their leaders here.

Supporting the proposals aimed at a further improvement in the typology of the leadership of the national liberation struggle in Africa, A.M. Pegushev observed that the conclusion as to the historical progressiveness of the early African anticolonial movements is not in contradiction with the fact that backward, regressive trends existed and were manifested in these movements.

Various aspects of the question of the feudal-aristocratic type of leadership were also examined in the papers of L. [Krizhan] (Hungary), V. Pavlikova (Czechoslovakia) and M. Tymowski and G. Staecker.

Taking as a basis little-known Hungarian 19th century sources--notes, diaries and letters of the missionary and traveler Magyar Laszlo--L. [Krizhan] analyzed the socioeconomic situation on the continent and the defensive capabilities of African societies prior to the European colonial invasion. L. [Krizhan] believes that as a consequence of the foregoing prolonged (since the mid-15th century) development of the transatlantic slave trade many African societies were in a critical situation by the mid-19th century. Following the prohibition of the slave trade, many regions of the interior oriented toward slave trading continued "by force of inertia" to deliver them in large numbers to the coast or to the new domestic markets which had sprung up in connection with the cessation of foreign sales. A trend was simultaneously observed toward an increase in the proportion of slave labor in the economy of the precolonial societies. All this markedly facilitated the colonial seizure of the continent.

During discussion of the paper G. Staecker and P. Sebald (GDR) noted the need for a Marxist comprehensive study of the impact of the slave trade on Africa's socioeconomic development and a more thorough analysis of the scale of the export of slaves in different historical periods. They believe that the role of the slave trade and slave labor in different parts of the continent were far from equal and that prohibition of the slave trade was not an act of synonymous effect; the slaves' place in commodity turnover between regions of the interior and the coast was replaced by other commodities in line with the cessation of the demand for them.

V. Pavlikova's paper "Problem of the Leadership of the Early National Liberation Struggle in Sub-Saharan Africa (in the Example of East Africa)" devoted the main attention to questions of unity and concerted action in the course of armed resistance to the European colonial usurpers. Analyzing the internal political situation in Buganda and Bunjoro--early feudal Mid-Lake states--in the final quarter of the 19th century, V. Pavlikova concluded that at the initial stage of the struggle these states, which had earlier been at daggers drawn and had been weakened by internal contradictions, operated in uncoordinated and disconnected fashion. Their rulers did not think of joint military-political actions and were unable to avail themselves of the aspiration of the masses to resist the aggressors. An understanding of the need for joint anticolonial actions began to come to them only as the colonial regime became harsher.

M. Tymowski and G. Staecker have interesting experience of the historical-biographical investigation of this type of anticolonial leadership. M. Tymowski's well-documented paper "The Rulers of Kenedougou [T'yeba] and Babemba) and French Colonial Expansion"<sup>8</sup> analyzed the military-diplomatic aspects of the activity of the leaders



of anticolonial resistance in West Africa. Operating by diplomatic methods (negotiations, agreements, the dispatch of missions and so forth), in the 1880's-1890's [T'yeba] and (after his death in 1893) Babemba--the rulers of a small state south-east of the present territory of Mali--attempted to prevent France's colonial seizure of their country. In 15 years this policy underwent, however, a remarkable evolution from the original intention of Kenedougou's rulers to use France in the struggle against its neighbors through their realization of the scale of the impending threat and attempts to gain time to prepare for an armed rebuff. This latter was successful, but in the unequal struggle which was initiated Babemba was defeated. During the assault on Sikasso--Kenedougou's capital--by French troops in April 1898 he committed suicide.

The chief weakness of the policy of the rulers of Kenedougou and other West African states lay, M. Tymowski believed, in the lack of unity among them. As in other parts of the continent, realization of the need for concerted action came too late: only in 1895 did Babemba begin talks with Samori about joint actions against the French.

A view of the problems of the national liberation movement through the fate of its leaders affords the research scholars extensive possibilities. G. Staecker's paper "Problem of an Evaluation of the Historical Role of Moshoeshoe" comprehensively analyzes the activity of this outstanding African politician and anticolonial leader of the 19th century. During his long rule Moshoeshoe implemented the process of assembling the scattered Basutho tribes and families into an all-tribal association, which for many years successfully resisted British and Boer colonial expansion. Moshoeshoe made skillful use of the contradictions between the Boers and the British and combined political, diplomatic and military means and methods of struggle. Recognizing the significance of European cultural, technical and military experience for the country's development and, particularly, for the organization of resistance, Moshoeshoe actively contributed to its introduction in the still inadequately differentiated Basutho society.

Other papers also dealt with the correlation of traditional (religious, ethnic and so forth) and contemporary factors in the activity of African leaders corresponding to different types of anticolonial leadership. The attention of J. Herzog (GDR) was attracted to the period of the development of the ideological-political views of Jomo Kenyatta, particularly the question of the role of traditionalist influences on the views of this well-known anticolonialist leader, who became independent Kenya's first president.

Kenyatta's political biography began in the first Kenyan anticolonial organizations, which had been set up on an ethnic basis and represented chiefly the interests of one people--the Kikuyu. As the paper mentioned, colonial oppression and cultural discrimination predetermined to a considerable extent the fact that at the early stages of his political activity Kenyatta and other Kenyan African leaders attached great significance to the spiritual values of traditional society. The influence of the latter were perceived in Kenyatta's views both in the process of their evolution toward bourgeois nationalism and after the government which he headed initiated an active policy of encouraging Kenya's development along a capitalist path.



Having emphasized the need for a thorough study of traditionalist influences at different stages of the anticolonial struggle, I.I. Filatova (USSR) observed in her speech that Kenyatta's political activity in different periods may be ascribed to the category of at least three of the above-mentioned types of leadership and almost always, moreover, not to one but to several simultaneously. The same may be said of many other political figures of tropical Africa.

The prerequisites of the emergence and singularities of the inception and development of the national-bourgeois trend in African anticolonial leadership were examined by P. Sebald and J. Milewski (Poland). P. Sebald's paper "The Sources of Bourgeois Interests in the Anticolonial Movement in Togo Prior to 1914," which was based on material of the GDR Central Archives in Potsdam, analyzed the socioeconomic reasons for the political galvanization of the emerging African bourgeoisie and its activity in the organization of anticolonial demonstrations at the start of the 20th century. P. Sebald observed that the increased severity of German colonial rule at the start of the 20th century in Togo caused the African merchants of Lome--the administrative center of the colony--who controlled the system of broker's trade in the country--appreciable economic harm. It was precisely this hitherto politically passive social group which initiated the 1909-1914 petition campaign, which acquired mass support and in which the specific demands of the bourgeois elements were veiled by the general demands of the entire population. However, following the arrests of the organizers of the first petitions, the African merchants ceased active political activity, and petit bourgeois elements and the representatives of the still small intelligentsia moved to the forefront of the struggle.

During the discussion of P. Sebald's paper mention was made of the need for a more precise determination of the social-class membership of the forces which organized the first such demonstrations in African countries; it would be more accurate, a number of symposium participants believed, to call them not bourgeois but "proto-bourgeois" elements.

In the paper "Businessmen, Professionals and the Colonial Economy in Nigeria (1880-1939)," which was based to a considerable extent on his field research in this country, M. Milewski traced the process of the formation of the Nigerian bourgeoisie and intelligentsia, the evolution of the relations of these social strata toward colonialism and the forms of their participation in the national liberation movement. J. Milewski links the changes in the political and anticolonial positions of the Nigerian "businessmen" (merchants, owners of private firms and companies and so forth) and "professionals" (physicians, lawyers, journalists and so forth) with changes in the colonial rule and intensification of the imperialist exploitation of the country. In the period in question the Nigerian bourgeoisie and intelligentsia underwent a complex evolution from attempts to cooperate with foreign capital and the colonial administration and illusions of the preservation of economic and political independence under the conditions of colonial domination through active inclusion in the anticolonial struggle. An important area of the anticolonial movement in Nigeria was the struggle in the economic sphere, which assumed the form of tough competition between private African and European firms and companies. The conception and subsequent growth of Nigerian nationalism was connected with the accession to the anticolonial leadership of representatives of the bourgeoisie and intelligentsia in the years between the wars.

The development of the national-bourgeois trend in the anticolonial movement in Africa was connected not only with the appearance in the political arena of a young African bourgeoisie but also with those bourgeois ideological and political influences to which all the politically active strata and groups of African society had long been and continue to be subjected. This aspect of the problem of the ideological-political formation of the leadership of the national liberation struggle in Africa was also illustrated in the course of the symposium. Taking as a basis material of the GDR Central Archives in Potsdam, A. Rueger, in particular, showed in his paper "The Attitude of Bourgeois Circles to the Colonial Question at the Time of the Weimar Republic" that at the start of the 1920's even Germany's imperialist circles had begun to gather information on communist and anticolonial organizations and had embarked on the elaboration of political and propaganda acts aimed at undermining their activity. This policy was implemented in cooperation with the leading colonial powers; an agreement was concluded between them and Germany on an exchange of appropriate information. Imperialist circles also attempted to split or subordinate to their influence the movement of solidarity with the African peoples' liberation struggle which had developed in Europe and, in particular, to prevent the creation of the Anti-Imperialist League.

Thus the paper emphasized that the bourgeois policy of the subversion and "social interception" of national liberation movements in Africa, which became so widespread after WWII, had very deep roots.

The paper of I. Ulrich (GDR) "Youth and Student Organizations as a School of Petit Bourgeois Leaders in the Anticolonial Struggle" was devoted to a little-studied, but very important political force of the anticolonial movement. As I. Ulrich observed, African youth and student organizations of an anticolonial and anti-imperialist orientation have played an appreciable part in the national liberation movement. These organizations, which exist in Africa and outside it (African student associations and associations of fellow countrymen abroad), became a most important channel of the spread both of socialist and bourgeois-reformist ideas among the African anticolonial leaders. In the sociopolitical plane the youth and student organizations always gravitated toward the petit bourgeois wing of the national liberation movement. The leaders who rose from them participated actively in the creation of mass anticolonial African parties.

The problem of the interconnection and interaction of the people's masses and leaders in the course of the national liberation struggle was also illustrated at the symposium. The paper of N.A. Ksenofontova (USSR) "The Question of the Role of the Leaders in the History of the National Liberation Movement in Rhodesia (End of the 19th Century to 1965)" analyzed this problem in the example of the white settler colony, which right up until recently was one of the last bastions of colonialism in Africa. The anticolonial struggle in former Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) was distinguished by the particular sharpness and intensity of events, and various forms and methods of struggle, included armed methods, were employed in it. Tracing the evolution of the role of the anticolonial leadership at different stages of this struggle, N.A. Ksenofontova observed that in the period between the wars the actions of the African political leaders and the masses ensued in essentially different, rarely contiguous planes. The situation changed in the mid-1940's, when the African trade unions, which had by this time become mass organizations, put

forward real leaders from their ranks. By the mid-1950's the liberation movement in Southern Rhodesia took up modern forms and methods of struggle and created political organizations with a clear-cut structure. Even the two rival parties--ZAPU and ZANU--had similar political programs and set the same tasks in the economic and social spheres.

C. Maehrdel's paper "The Sociopolitical Situation and the Leading Forces of the National Liberation Movement in Africa in the Period 1945-1960" provided a broad picture of the national liberation struggle after WWII. Taking as a basis his own research into this set of problems,<sup>9</sup> the speaker observed that the leadership of the national liberation movement in Africa operated under the conditions of the development of three social trends after WWII. First, the growing antagonism between the colonial exploiters and the exploited and the marked increase in social polarization. Second, changes in the social structure (growth of the bourgeoisie, the working class and the intermediate strata), which influenced the activity of the leadership of the African liberation organizations and led, in particular, to the patriotic intelligentsia frequently appearing as the political representative of the national bourgeoisie, which, in turn, was realizing its political possibilities more by the indirect than the direct path. And, third, the markedly increased activeness of the masses.

C. Maehrdel observed that the national-revolutionary situation in Africa which had been created after WWII could not of itself have led to the collapse of colonial domination. In order for this to occur the leaders and people's masses had to find new forms of organizational work and operate jointly with the political parties and also in the trade unions, war veteran and benevolent societies, tribal alliances and cultural and church organizations. The struggle to achieve state independence was made more difficult by the actions of imperialism, which attempted by a policy of reforms to postpone the downfall of the colonial system. C. Maehrdel believes that there are no grounds for speaking of the low political level of the anticolonial leaders of that time. The political horizons of many African anticolonial leaders of the postwar period broadened considerably thanks to their participation in the pan-African solidarity movement and also to the strengthened relations with such international organizations as the World Trade Union Congress and the World Peace Council.

It was the unanimous opinion of the participants in the symposium that it was an important new step on the path of study of the problems of the African national liberation movement and the broadening of the cooperation of Africanists of the socialist countries.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Various aspects of this subject were examined, in particular, at symposia of Africanist historians of the socialist countries in Varna (1975) and Budapest (1977). The material of these symposia has been published. See "Problemy kolonializma i stanovleniya antikolonial'nykh sil. Soobshcheniya istorikov-afrikanistov sotsialisticheskikh stran" [Problems of Colonialism and the Development of Anticolonial Forces. Reports of Africanist Historians of the Socialist Countries], Moscow, 1979; "Contemporary Problems of the Historiography and Source Study of National Liberation Movements in Africa," NAUCHNOYE STAT'1



O RAZVIVAYUSHCHIKHSYA STRANAKH No 96, Budapest, 1978; "Problems of African History and Anticolonial Resistance," ASIAN, AFRICA, LATINAMERIKA, Berlin, special issue 2, 1977; "Sources and Historiography on National Liberation Movements," STUDIES ON DEVELOPING COUNTRIES No 96, Budapest, 1978; see also A.M. Pegushev, "Africanists of the Socialist Countries on Trends in the Historiography of National Liberation Movements in Africa (on the Results of the 1977 Budapest Symposium)," NARODY AZII I AFRIKI No 3, 1978; N.A. Ksenofontova, "Cooperation of Africanists of the Socialist Countries," AZIYA I AFRIKA SEGODNYA No 2, 1980; and N.A. Ksenofontova, "A Meeting of Africanists From Socialist Countries," ASIA AND AFRICA TODAY No 1, Moscow, 1980.

2. A.B. Letnev and Yu. V. Lukonin (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Africa), V.P. Gorodnov, V. Ye. Ovchinnikov and G.V. Tsypkin (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of General History) and A.B. Davidson (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies) also sent their papers to Leipzig for publication in the works of the symposium.
3. The typology of the national liberation movements proposed by Soviet Africanists and the authors of a two-volume history of the national liberation movement in Africa was made the basis of this division. See "Istoriya natsional'no-osvoboditel'noy bor'by v Afrike v novoye vremya" [History of the National Liberation Struggle in Africa in Recent Times], Moscow, 1976, pp 25-26. The enumerated trends of leadership were described in general outline in the symposium's advance program prepared by the work group "History of Africa and the National Liberation Movement in Africa."
4. See, for example, "Protest Movements in Colonial East Africa: Aspects of the Early African Response to European Rule," Syracuse, New York, 1973.
5. See, for example, "A History of Tanzania," edited by I. Kisanbo and A. Temu, Nairobi, 1969; S. Kivanuka, "A History of Buganda From the Foundation of the Kingdom to 1900," N.Y., 1972; and H. Meebelo, "Reaction to Colonialism: A Prelude to the Politics of Independence in Northern Zambia 1893-1939," Manchester, 1971.
6. See T. Buettner, "Geschichte Afrikas," vol 1, "Afrika von den Anfängen bis zu territorialen Aufteilung. Afrikas durch die imperialistischen Mächte," Berlin, 1976; idem., "Sozialpolitische Zielsetzung und früherer antikolonialer Kampf," WISSENSCHAFTLICHE ZEITSCHRIFT DER KARL-MARX-UNIVERSITÄT No 6, Leipzig, 1976.
7. See K. Marx, F. Engels, "On the Polish Question," "Soch." [Work], 2d ed., vol 4; F. Engels, "Debates on the Polish Question in Frankfurt," ibid., vol 5.
8. M. Tymowski made use of material of the national archives of Senegal and France. He is also the author of a work on Samori Toure--an outstanding leader of the anticolonial resistance in Africa. See "Samori--bohater Czarnej Afryki," Warsaw, 1976.
9. See, for example, C. Maehrde, "Afrikanische Parteien in revolutionären Befreiungskampf," Berlin, 1977.

COPYRIGHT: "Narody Azii i afriki", 1980

B850

CSO: 1807

## INTERNATIONAL

### PRIMAKOV ANALYZES COMMON TRAITS OF DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Moscow NARODY AZII I AFRIKI in Russian No 5, 1980 signed to press 1 Oct 80 pp 15-18

[Article by Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies and specialist in problems of the national liberation movement: "The Developing Countries: Problems of Community"]

[Text] "Glancing at the picture of the modern world," L.I. Brezhnev said at the 25th CPSU Congress, "attention has to be drawn to such an important feature as the considerable increase in the influence of states which even recently were colonies or semicolonies."<sup>1</sup>

The conclusion as to the increased influence of the emancipated countries<sup>2</sup> is corroborated entirely in real life. These countries' role in the world economy has increased and their impact on world politics and international relations has intensified since the 25th CPSU Congress. The progressive socioeconomic and political changes—sometimes revolutionarily abrupt—are making a considerable contribution to the development of the world revolutionary process.

As the CPSU Program observes, the emancipated countries "are not a part either of the system of imperialist states or of the system of socialist states."<sup>3</sup> Is it possible under such circumstances to identify them as some kind of community or is their participation in world-historical development following the collapse of the colonial system determined by a sum total of individual "involvements"? This is not an idle or purely academic question even. Our conception of the presence or absence of common regularities of the development of former colonies or semicolonies depends on the answer to it. An analysis of the present situation and the development prospects of a considerable part of the former colonial world is made difficult (if not impossible) without an answer to this question.

There was no doubt as to the community inherent in the oriental countries in the colonial period. Despite the fact that these countries differed in the degree of dependence (colonies, protectorates and countries which were formally sovereign, but which were entirely subordinate to the metropolis) and their development level, they were all part of imperialism's colonial system. Their common characteristics were a lack of independence, a position of exploited appendage (sales markets and, what became particularly important under monopoly capitalism, spheres of capital investment) and the reservation for them of agrarian-raw material specialization in the international capitalist division of labor.

The liquidation of the colonial system led to a loss of some of these characteristics. The former colonies and semicolonies acquired political independence and state sovereignty and in this sense ceased to differ, as a whole, from the states of the rest of the world. A process of industrialization has begun and enjoyed a certain development in a number of countries: they are no longer merely agrarian-raw material appendages of imperialism in the old meaning of this word. At the same time there is no chance of reducing the emancipated countries to a single group on the basis of homogeneousness of the regimes which have been established in them, which in different countries represent the interests of different classes and social groups or "combinations" thereof. The discrepancy in development levels between individual oriental countries has increased even more since emancipation, and this fact also is not contributing to their unification in a single group.

Under these conditions it is obvious that a "retrospective" criterion (membership in the past of imperialism's colonial system) alone is insufficient for regarding the emancipated states as some kind of community. It is far more important to determine whether the former colonies and semicolonies possess common characteristics connected with their present situation.

Real life answers this question in the affirmative. Under present conditions also the nonsocialist emancipated countries have much in common: low level of economic development; a particular place in the world capitalist economy conditioned by the preservation of their position of the exploited periphery of world capitalism; and a multistructural economy.

For distinguishing the emancipated countries as a single group it is very important to take account of subjective political characteristics, which manifested themselves in a particularly contrasting manner in the 1960's-1970's. Among these we should primarily include the policy of nonalignment and struggle for the democratization of world economic relations and for a new economic order being pursued by the majority of emancipated countries.

However, a conclusion as to the presence of common traits making the emancipated countries a definite community is not the same as an assertion concerning the existence of some "third world" allegedly proceeding along a particular path of formation-al development. In determining the community of developing states it would appear necessary to proceed from two fundamental features: the fact of the division of the modern world into two opposite sociopolitical systems and the characteristic of the modern historical era being one of transition from capitalism to socialism.

The group of emancipated states currently unites both countries proceeding along a capitalist path and countries which have opted for a socialist orientation. And, furthermore, there is an ongoing trend of the gradual "erosion" of this group both thanks to the association of certain of the states incorporated in it with the world socialist system and thanks to the transition of certain others to the group of developed capitalist countries. Of course, this "erosion" is a protracted historical process. The community of the emancipated states is quite inert. But this very protractedness is by no means proof that the group of emancipated states is developing or may develop in accordance with laws different from those which, as a whole, are determining the nature of our era and the trends and directions of

social progress or that the determined nature of the movement of the developing countries ultimately toward socialism—either directly or via capitalism, whose development is broken off at a certain stage—does not exist.

The relative instability and mobility of the composition of the group of developing countries is a consequence of more than just its transitional nature. It is well known that each system—both socialist and capitalist—consists of states which are basically homogeneous in basis and superstructure characteristics: in the prevailing production relations and their corresponding political, legal and other social ideas and establishments. The indicators of this homogeneity (which does not, naturally, do away with the question of the singularities and specifics of the development of individual countries) are in both cases the principal criterion of the integrity of the two systems. It should be stressed particularly that this principal criterion may be found only in the sphere of the basis and superstructure. Meanwhile the community of emancipated countries lacks this principal criterion. The emancipated countries are heterogeneous both in socioeconomic (basis) and superstructural characteristics.

A number of research scholars attempts to separate the emancipated countries in a single group with the aid of some sole principal criterion. Some see this principal criterion in the multistructural nature of the economy,<sup>4</sup> others in the type of dependent development of the emancipated countries.<sup>5</sup> But the search for one principal determinant of the community of the emancipated countries has proven, it would seem, fruitless.

The Maoist "three worlds" theory, which united in a single "third world" different states with an underdeveloped economy—both capitalist and socialist—was a kind of attempt to invent a principal criterion for a group of developing countries, but with complete disregard for a class approach. This "theory" does not so much determine the common features which characterize the developing countries in the postcolonial period as erase the boundary between the two opposite sociopolitical systems, alining all countries emancipated from colonial dependence, irrespective of whether socialist revolutions occurred in them or whether they are developing along a capitalist path.

A similar alinement of various former colonial and semicolonial countries in total abstraction from the nature of their socioeconomic system is also typical of those who regard the "extrabloc criterion" as the principal characteristic determining the community of developing countries. As is known, the world has various military organizations: on the one hand those created by imperialist states and, on the other, the Warsaw Pact, which was the response of a number of socialist states to the creation of the North Atlantic Alliance (NATO). However, neither NATO and other imperialist military alliances nor the Warsaw Pact are primary—they are secondary and derive from the two opposite social systems—nor, moreover, are they mandatory either for world capitalism or world socialism. It is well known that NATO and also other imperialist military alliances unite by no means all the developed capitalist states, and not all socialist states participate in the Warsaw Pact. But can we believe merely on the basis of this that the participants in the above-mentioned pacts have more in common with one another than the capitalist countries have with the rest of the capitalist world and the socialist countries have with other socialist countries? Is it, finally, even possible to equate all military alliances, irrespective of the purpose for which they were created and the motivations of their activity?



The idea of the comprehensive nature of the criterion determining the integrity and specificity of a group of developing countries was expressed back in the mid-1960's by S.I. Tyul'panov. He believes that this criterion should take account of the "particular place in the system of world economic and political relations; the level of economic development and the specific features of reproduction; and the singularities of the socioeconomic structure."<sup>6</sup> The author was perfectly correct to proceed from the fact that this comprehensive criterion of the community of emancipated countries should incorporate a determination of their place in the world economy, the level and type of development and a formational characterization.

The authors of the above-mentioned collective monograph "Razvivayushchiyesya strany: zakonomernosti, tendentsii, perspektivy" [The Developing Countries: Regularities, Trends, Prospects], which was prepared under the leadership of V.L. Tyagunenko, R.M. Avakov and K.L. Maydanik, also construct a comprehensive criterion in accordance with an analogous outline, in general. A certain amplification and development of the comprehensive criterion concept is provided in an article by V.L. Sheynis published in 1978.<sup>7</sup> The classification spheres which he proposed for creating a typology of the developing countries could also serve for the formulation of a comprehensive criterion of the developing world as a single system: social orientation; formational (structural) characteristics; level and type of development of the production forces; position in the world capitalist economy; and economic potential.

It would seem necessary at the same time to add to the criteria based on these socioeconomic classifications characteristics of a political order. The complex of characteristics in accordance with which a community of developing countries is determined could obviously be represented thus:

unilateral dependence or "asymmetrical interdependence" in relation to the centers of world capitalism, which predetermines the emancipated countries' particular place in the world capitalist economy;

multistructural nature of the economy of a society of the transitional type under a nonsocialist formation-forming structure;

relatively low level and, corresponding thereto, type of development of the production forces; and

antagonistic incompatibility of national interests with imperialist interests and the policy of the developed capitalist states.

Let us examine each of these criteria separately.

Unilateral dependence or "asymmetrical interdependence." Despite all the relativity of these concepts, they obviously more adequately reflect the particular place which belongs to the developing countries in the world capitalist economy than the "dependent type of development" concept proposed as the criterion by the authors of the monograph "Razvivayushchiyesya strany: zakonomernosti, tendentsii, perspektivy."

The problem of dependence needs amplifying in the light of the processes occurring in the world capitalist economy. It should be examined in differentiated manner, at different levels. It may be noted primarily that the economic dependence concept

essentially extends to relations between all states participating in the world capitalist economy. The trend of the growth of interdependence is a function of the internationalization of production accompanying the development of capitalism, the extension of the capitalist division of labor, the strengthening of the positions and activity of the transnational corporations and of integration processes--of everything which largely characterizes the state and prospects of the world capitalist economy. Consequently, in order to indicate the particular place which belongs to the developing countries in this economy it is necessary to determine the level and thereby the nature of dependence.

The type of dependence intrinsic to relations between the capitalist center and its "periphery" differs from the type of dependence inherent in the developed capitalist countries--currency-financial, technological, technical and economic as a whole. In the latter instance, despite all the conditionality of this term, it is a question of interdependence arising as a result of the international division of labor in a group of developed capitalist countries. This "conventional" interdependence embraces components which are homogeneous in qualitative, although different in quantitative characteristics. In the first instance, on the other hand, there is either unilateral dependence or "asymmetrical interdependence."

Of course, interdependence in the relations of the developed capitalist countries is also not balanced. It is only possible to speak very approximately of its "symmetry." Spain, Portugal and Greece, for example, which are included in the group of developed capitalist countries, are considerably more economically dependent on the United States, the FRG, France and Britain than are the latter on them. This also applies to the small European countries. And even the "leaders" of the Common Market and Japan are still more scientifically and technologically dependent on the United States than is the United States on them. However, the element of asymmetry which is preserved in this instance does not, it seems, determine the fundamental nature of interdependence in the group of developed capitalist countries; in the relations between the capitalist center--the developed capitalist states--and its periphery--the emancipated countries--on the other hand, the asymmetry is determining.

At the same time we should note the difference between the "asymmetrical interdependence" and "unilateral dependence" concepts. The latter is no longer characteristic of an entire group of developing countries under the conditions which have evolved in the world, although many emancipated states continue to be unilaterally dependent on the capitalist center. The point is, though, that together with these, emancipated states exist which while remaining an exploited part of the world capitalist economy have simultaneously risen to a higher level and may be deemed to have crossed to the lowest level of an unbalanced bilateral dependence. It is precisely this type of bilateral dependence, whereupon the inequality of the partners, the exploitation of the developing countries by foreign monopoly capital, the imbalance of the commercial flows, the vulnerability of the reproduction process to outside influence and the clear-cut limitation of their economic maneuvering are preserved, which may be defined as "asymmetrical."

The relations of the emancipated oil-producing countries with the developed capitalist states under the conditions of the former's far greater independence than previously in determining production quotas and the price of oil and, in a number of

instances, the direction of commercial flows thereof even are an example of "asymmetrical interdependence." These relations have already gone beyond the framework of the "traditional" relations "typical" of the preceding period.

The export of capital in the form of investments in the developed capitalist states of part of the increased revenue of the oil-producing countries not absorbed locally is also contributing to bilateral dependence. It is sufficient to say, for example, that by the start of the 1980's Saudi Arabia had become a major exporter of capital to the United States and West Europe and that, according to available indications, by the end of the present decade the profit from this capital will be comparable to that from oil production. All this cannot fail to entail changes not only in the forms but also the level of the dependence of such countries on the developed capitalist states.

Do these and similar developing countries—those, for example, which as a result of the activity of the transnational corporations have become exporters not merely of raw material but mainly intermediate and finished products—have a prospect of a departure from "asymmetrical interdependence" and a gradual rapprochement with the type of interdependence of which the relations within the group of developed capitalist states are characteristic? Of course, we are dealing in the formulation of this question with an insignificant number of states which have constituted in the process of ever increasing differentiation the highest group of developing countries.

The answer to this question is connected in a certain sense with our understanding of the prospects of the struggle for the democratization of world economic relations and a new international economic order. Despite all the extraordinary complexity and exceptional difficulty of this struggle, its success should not, it would seem, be synonymously connected with the prospects of the complete elimination of imperialism. Given the evolved correlation of forces in the world and, particularly, taking account of the increasing impact of world socialism on the course of historical development, the democratization of economic relations within the framework of the world capitalist economy—incomplete and inconsistent, naturally—is a feasible alternative. And it will be primarily the emancipated countries, which already hold certain levers of economic influence on the developed capitalist states, which will be able to take advantage of this incomplete and inconsistent democratization. "Even now it is clear that, given the present correlation of world class forces, the emancipated countries are entirely able to resist imperialist diktat and achieve just, that is, equal economic relations," the CPSU Central Committee report to the 25th CPSU Congress<sup>9</sup> emphasized.

I believe that, albeit not direct and to a certain extent conditional, there nevertheless exists an analogy between the approach to the prospects of the struggle for a new international economic order and the struggle against the threat of world war. This threat is created, as is known, by the very development of state-monopoly capitalism. However, under the evolved conditions and considering the cardinal changes in the correlation of forces between socialism and capitalism, world war has ceased to be inevitable.

The authors of the book "Razvivayushchiyesya strany: zakonornosti, tendentsii, perspektivy" in fact reduce the problem of the liquidation of the dependence of



all developing countries to their transition to the world socialist system.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, this is the shortest and most radical path and the only one providing upon the elimination of "asymmetrical interdependence" for satisfaction of the interests of the working people's masses. At the same time it would seem that under the new conditions it has become possible for certain developing countries to overcome "asymmetrical interdependence" and for them to draw close to the level of "conventional" interdependence even without leaving the world capitalist economy. Further changes in the correlation of forces in favor of world socialism, which both directly and obliquely strengthens the emancipated countries' positions in their struggle for equality in international economic relations, are contributing to this. New conditions are also being created by the development of the general crisis of capitalism, particularly its structural crises—energy, raw material, ecological and currency. The sharp intensification of structural crises is a qualitatively new phenomenon whose possible consequences require the most thorough investigation in connection with the prospects of the mutual relations of the developed capitalist and developing countries included. The new conditions are also characterized by socio-economic and political changes in the emancipated countries themselves buttressing the trend toward their independence. This may be reflected particularly in the position in the world capitalist economy of the group of countries of a socialist orientation, which are using not only in indirect and general form but also directly and concretely, as a rule, and to a considerably greater extent than the other emancipated countries the undoubted advantages to be derived from economic and political relations with the socialist community countries.

The conclusion as to the possibility of a diminution in or liquidation even for certain former colonies and semicolonies of the "asymmetrical" nature of their economic relations with the developed capitalist countries (under conditions where these emancipated countries continue to be in the world capitalist economy) contradicted the imperfect and, possibly, already obsolete "select model" of dependent development. According to this model, there is a process whereby the periphery follows to a certain extent along the spiral (at a remove of a "minimum of one twist") behind the capitalist center, with the obligatory preservation of the former's unilateral dependence on the latter. The flaw in this model is the underestimation of the new conditions of the development of capitalism and its increased unevenness in different emancipated countries.

The very appearance of "dependent development" concepts was caused by the logical aspiration to surmount underestimation of the significance of external factors for the development of the emancipated countries. These factors truly play a very important part. But spread of the "dependent development" concept has led to a certain diminution in the role of internal factors, which in a number of instances are regarded merely as agents of external forces. Yet it is evidently necessary to stress the interconnection and mutual influence of external and internal factors.

A study of the singularities of the development of capitalism in the emancipated countries, the role of the state in this development and the nature of social changes appears very important for an analysis of the conditions and mechanism of transition to the group of developed capitalist countries. In speaking of the prospects of surmounting "asymmetrical dependence" it needs to be emphasized, however, that it is a question of possibilities really appearing only for certain emancipated countries. Certain Western research scholars' division of the "third world" into



'fourth' and even "fifth" worlds essentially reflects the ongoing differentiation of the developing countries economically, but not the liquidation of the basic qualitative characteristics inherent in the community of emancipated states.

At the same time former colonial and dependent countries as a whole are ceasing to be the reserve of the last exploiter system in the era of universal transition from capitalism to socialism. The entry of certain developing states into the group of developed capitalist countries by no means signifies a "rejuvenation" and strengthening of world capitalism. New contradictions emerge in the world capitalist system upon this transition. Their investigation and a study of the nature and concrete manifestations of the anti-imperialist trends in the policy of the new members of the group of developed capitalist countries is of great theoretical and practical interest.

**Multistructural nature of the economy.** The multistructural nature of the economy is not in itself something specific for the developing countries and, consequently, cannot be the criterion marking them off from the two world systems--socialist and capitalist. The world presently has three types of states with a multistructural economy: states where the transition from one social formation to another is being completed and where "biformal" structures exist; certain capitalist states where "biformal" multistructure is a "residual" phenomenon (Italy with its relatively poorly developed South, Greece, Portugal and Spain); and developed capitalist countries in which various uniformational structures exist.

Nor is the type of states with a multistructural transitional economy homogeneous. A number of socialist countries (in the past, before the complete victory of socialism in the USSR, the Soviet Union also) fall in this category. And all the developing countries--both those which are completing the transition to capitalism and those which have adopted a socialist orientation--belong to the type of states with a transitional multistructural economy. For this reason "multistructural nature of the economy" viewed in the form of the criterion of the community of developing countries needs amplification: this is the multistructural nature of the economy of a society of a transitional type given a nonsocialist formational (system-forming) structure.

A.I. Levkovskiy correctly pointed to the inertia of the multistructural economy in the developing countries. This is connected with the relatively slow pace and forms of the development of capitalism different from the "traditional" deformed, unilateral forms. At the same time certain research scholars have drawn from this fact the conclusion as to an amorphous "interformational" stage at which the emancipated countries allegedly are. But the transition from one socioeconomic formation to another does not occur in the form of a mechanical coupling of two systems which have already taken shape. The matter cannot be portrayed such that the "spent" formation withers away, after which a transitional period ("margin") between the two formations begins, and only then does the society enter a new stage of its development.

This formulation of the question is unacceptable both theoretically and in the political-practical plane. Substantiating the scientific theory of a society's formational development, K. Marx, F. Engels and V.I. Lenin approached the problem of the transition from one social formation to another dialectically. They emphasized that a new formation--slave-owning, feudal or capitalist--is conceived

in an old formation and that the society's onward movement and the transition from the lowest formation to a higher one is effected by the development of new production relations and the retreat and subsequent ousting of those intrinsic to the old formation. The transitional period begins precisely as a result of the conception in the old society of new production relations corresponding to the nature and level of development of the production forces. History does not provide a single example of this transition occurring in a "vacuum" and outside of the definite formation within whose framework each given society is in each given period of its development.

A number of research scholars who support the "interformational stage" concept deny the presence in a multistructural economy of a leading structure or, more precisely, leading production relations (this could also be a complex of structures united by single formational indications). It seems that with this denial:

first, account is not taken of the dialectics of the unity and struggle of opposites which are the basis of formational development and the basis of the very dynamics of society;

second, there is a manifest underestimation of the most important role of the "external environment"--the world capitalist economy--of which the given society is a part (the laws of the world economy exert their influence on practically all spheres of the developing countries' economic life, including, naturally, their traditional structures);

third, account is not taken of the effect of the law of the uneven nature of the development of individual parts of the world capitalist economy (V.I. Lenin, as is known, pointed to the fact that this law has force with respect not only to different capitalist states but also different sectors of industry, production facilities and structures); and

fourth, the existence of a common reproduction mechanism and the interconnection of the structures is ignored; the latter cannot be examined in isolation. Despite all the fractionality of the reproduction process and the relative independence of the structures on whose basis the corresponding production relations are reproduced, it would be wrong in contemporary society to absolutize this "autonomy" and, which is no less important, to regard the structures themselves in their statics and not to observe their development. R.A. Ul'yanovskiy adduces figures on the use in the emancipated countries of hired manpower (which is, as is known, a most important criterion of the degree of capitalist development) and rightly asserts that in this indicator a number of these countries are entirely comparable with the group of developed capitalist states.<sup>11</sup> An even more clear-cut picture could be provided by the dynamics of this indicator upon an examination of the diversification of the structure of hired manpower, which attests the increasing degree of interaction of the leading capitalist structure in the developing countries with other structures.

Ascertainment of the presence of a leading structure is not identical to the assertion that the transitional period is at an end and that a given society is developing within the framework of a new formation represented by this structure. Leading structure is a concept corresponding to the multistructural economy of the transitional type. Under the conditions of the transitional period--both from

precapitalist formations to capitalism and from capitalism to socialism--the leading structure is obviously that which represents the higher formation.<sup>12</sup> It is not even a matter of its relative significance in the national economy in the present stretch of time--it may even yet yield to other structures both in gross domestic product and in the number of those employed. The point is that the structures develop unevenly, and one--the leading one--begins to perform unifying, integrating functions; it is precisely this one which determines the mechanism of the functioning and development of the entire multistructural economy viewed as a single system. Naturally, the increase in its relative significance increases the significance of this structure as the driving force of the system's development.

In the countries of a socialist orientation, in which the formation-forming capitalist processes are broken off, the state structure is undoubtedly the leading structure.

The countries of a socialist orientation can purposefully use the state sector and economic policy for influencing other structures and controlling their functioning. The activity of foreign capital and the private-capitalist sector of the economy is liable to such control primarily.

The state-capitalist sector and economic policy in certain developing countries proceeding along a capitalist path is also used by the forces in power to influence the process of the development of certain other structures. Denial of a leading structure under these conditions signifies an underestimation of the influence of the superstructure on the basis and of policy as a whole on the economy which is manifested particularly strongly in the transitional period of the society's development.

The relatively low level and, corresponding thereto, type of the development of the production forces. This criterion is obviously one of the most developed in literature--with regard for quantitative indicators included. A big contribution to its development was made, for example, by the authors of the monograph "Tipologiya nesotsialisticheskikh stran" [A Typology of Nonsocialist Countries],<sup>13</sup> who provided a broad socioeconomic characterization of the level of development of production forces incorporating an analysis of the "human factor" (an examination from a social-cultural angle of the main production force--the aggregate worker) and a revelation of the type of production forces. The level of economic development, which is lower, as a whole, than the group of developed capitalist states, is the indicator of the community of the emancipated countries. Concerning the type of the development of the emancipated countries' production forces, on the other hand, the monograph's authors define it for the majority of these countries as "pre-industrial" and for certain countries as "industrial." Consequently, it is no longer possible to unite all states emancipated from colonial dependence in a community on the basis of single type of production forces. At the same time it may obviously be concluded that, given a comparatively lower level of economic development, the pre-industrial type as a whole is characteristic of the production forces of the emancipated countries--given the existence and rapid development therein of industrial "enclaves."

At the same time the process of the differentiation of the emancipated countries, which is occurring quite rapidly, is particularly perceptible in precisely this criterion--level and type of development of the production forces.



Antagonistic incompatibility of national interests with imperialist interests and the policy of the developed capitalist states. It is a question not only of a "retrospective community" of emancipated states in accordance with this characteristic, although, it stands to reason, the colonial past has made anti-imperialism a most important characteristic of the mass consciousness in these countries. The "retrospective" element retains a certain significance today also, creating in the developing countries the corresponding psychological climate and influencing their policy--to a different extent in different countries. However, together with this there exists a corresponding contemporary indicator of community--it should mainly be a question of this in this case.

National interests are an objective category reflecting the need for the creation of comprehensive conditions--economic, social, political and military-defense--conducive to the all-around development of a given nation.

Bourgeois, particularly American, political science in practice reduces "national interests" to the external sphere--international relations. This is understandable: if this category is viewed as also related to the domestic life of the country and its people, it becomes even more apparent that the state-monopoly policy pursued to the benefit of a narrow group of the population representing monopoly capital does not primarily correspond to national requirements. The example of state regulation in the United States following the onset of the energy crisis in the capitalist world (end of 1973), which did not protect the interests of the mass consumer of oil and gas products but ultimately served the interests of the big American oil companies, is typical in this respect. It is significant that the retail price of gasoline, the consumer of which in the United States is the bulk of the gainfully employed population, tripled from the start of 1974 through the start of 1980 despite a simultaneous unprecedented increase in the profits of the major American oil companies.

#### Profits of the Biggest U.S. Oil Companies (millions of dollars)

Company	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979
Exxon	2,503	2,641	2,443	2,771	4,295
Gulf	700	816	752	787	1,322
Mobil	810	943	1,005	1,129	2,010
Socal	773	880	1,016	1,088	1,785
Texaco	831	870	890	853	1,759

Source: BUSINESS WEEK 17 March 1980, p 102.

American politicians and political scientists identify "national interests" with "state interests." This identification is not legitimate under capitalism. It is well known that even under the conditions of the existing tendency of its relative "independence" the state was and remains in the developed capitalist countries an instrument of the ruling class and protects its interests. In the developing countries proceeding along the capitalist path the spectrum of society's requirements incorporated in the "state interests" concept is broader; power in a number of instances belongs to class-social combinations, whose composition also includes the petite bourgeoisie of the city and countryside. In the countries of a socialist



orientation, particularly those where the ruling parties endeavor to arm themselves with the ideology of scientific socialism, the concepts of "national" and "state" interests come close to one another in principle. Finally, they coincide with the socialist countries, where the state serves the interests initially of the majority of the people--the working people--and, following the liquidation of the exploiter class, the whole people.

The sphere of "national interests" is far from boundless. They cannot be realized at the expense of the interests of other peoples and at the expense of general human interests, which require the stability of international relations, lasting peace, the joint efforts of the peoples and states to conserve the environment and the employment of mutually profitable economic relations. Thus the limiter of "national interests" is their compatibility with the national (we stress: it is a question precisely of "national" and not of "state" interests as understood in the capitalist world) interests of other countries and, of course, with general human interests. This compatibility is particularly necessary under the conditions of the existence in the modern world of two opposed sociopolitical systems and the appearance of weapons of mass destruction possessing tremendous destructive force. Naturally, given these circumstances, particular significance is attached not to the rigid demarcation of the national interests of different countries but to determination of spheres where they coincide--at the level of general human tasks and on a multi-lateral and bilateral basis.

The emancipated countries' objective national interests are decisively contrary to the goals of the monopoly capital of the developed capitalist countries and imperialist policy, which provides for the achievement of these goals.

First, neocolonialist practice opposes the requirements of the emancipated countries' comprehensive development. The monopoly capital of the developed capitalist countries continues to maintain course for preserving the emancipated countries in the form of supplier of raw material resources, a sphere of capital investment and a market for the sale of its goods. This "peripheral" incorporation of the emancipated countries in the world capitalist economy is not abating in connection with the development of new processes and trends--the transfer of a number of "dirty," laborious and energy-consuming production processes to these countries. The scientific-technical dependence of the majority of emancipated countries on the "capitalist center" is broadening and deepening.

The complete incompatibility of the developing states' national interests with the interests of the monopoly circles of the developed capitalist countries is manifested in the fundamentally different approaches to the problem of the democratization of international economic relations. Whereas the developing states insist on radical changes in the terms of trade and the creation of proportions between the prices of imported industrial commodities and exported raw material and intermediate goods more favorable to them, monopoly circles consent merely to negligible changes which essentially maintain the discrimination against the emancipated countries in world capitalist trade.

Second, the endeavor of state-monopoly capitalism to pump out in accordance with the requirements of the developed capitalist countries within compressed deadlines, on a large scale and at the lowest possible price the nonrenewable fuel-raw material resources of the developing world is contrary to the developing states' national

interests under the conditions of their increasingly successful struggle for sovereignty over their own natural resources. An example of this is the United States' persistent pressure on Saudi Arabia for an increase in oil production in this country in spite of geological conditions preventing the accelerated development of the deposits. This pressure is all the more contrasting against the background of the energy policy in the United States itself, where the doubling of oil production envisaged in the "Independence" program proclaimed by President R. Nixon in 1974 has been abandoned (a reason given for abandoning it was the conclusion as to the rapid depletion of the United States' oil resources if their development were to be stepped up). The United States is exerting similar pressure on the oil-exporting emancipated countries and with respect to the question of oil prices.

Third, the incompatibility of the developing countries' national interests with the goals of the imperialist powers is also manifested in the approach to the solution of global problems. The emancipated states acutely need the limitation and, subsequently, the cessation of the arms race, which would not only ward off the threat of thermonuclear war, improve the international situation and sharply reduce the possibility of the outbreak of international conflicts but would also make it possible to channel considerable additional foreign and domestic resources directly toward economic and social development goals. Militarist circles in the developed capitalist countries are leading matters toward the continuation and intensification of the arms race.

The emancipated states are fully interested in a strengthening of the trend of a relaxation of international tension. The departure from this trend which has been observed in U.S. policy promises the emancipated countries new attempts to incorporate them in military blocs and the danger of an extension of the imperialist powers' military presence and the creation of new foreign bases on the territory of the developing states or in their vicinity. In other words, the risk of the emancipated countries' involvement in dangerous imperialist adventures is growing, and at the same time new threats are emerging to the gains achieved on the path of independent development.

The particular incompatibility of the emancipated countries' national interests with the interests of the ruling groups of the developed capitalist states was revealed in connection with the "power methods" which the U.S. Administration began to implement on the threshold of the 1980's--in the form of military-political and economic pressure on Iran and in the form of a show of military strength in the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean.

The theory of factors which "stabilize" and "destabilize" the international situation with which the United States has armed itself is sharply contrary to the interests of the emancipated states. Social and political shifts in the developing countries which are occurring in spite of imperialist influence and undermining the positions of the United States or its NATO allies are viewed as "destabilizing" features on the basis of this "theory." American politicians consider not only the strengthening of the West's military positions but also direct interference in the developing countries' internal affairs "stabilizing" measures in this situation.

The incompatibility of the emancipated countries' national interests and imperialist policy is the basis of the preservation under present postcolonial conditions

of the anti-imperialist directivity of the oriental countries' policy. Of course, this conclusion as to the objective basis of anti-imperialism in the policy of the oriental countries does not mean that anti-imperialism is characteristic of all emancipated countries to an equal extent and that it is consistent in all instances and "automatically" ensues from the people's vital interests. The heterogeneousness of the postcolonial East, the deepening process of the differentiation of the emancipated countries and also the fact that policy is largely determined by subjective features are, of course, reflected in the real state of affairs. We believe it essential merely to stress that an objective basis for such anti-imperialism exists and that its presence serves as a common characteristic of the emancipated countries.

Thus only a complex of criteria may determine the integrity and specifics of a group of developing countries. The unconditional distinctiveness of the community in question consists of the absence in this complex of a permanent main criterion. Whereas the socialist or capitalist systems with their inherent basis and superstructure characteristics appear precisely as socialist or capitalist in whatever aspect they are analysed—from the viewpoint of their place in the world economy, international relations or in the world revolutionary process—the world of the developing countries has a different "profile" depending on the "context" of the analysis. In each given case the complex of criteria is shaped up in a different hierarchy. For example, the developing countries' determining community with respect to world economic relations is their presence in the world capitalist economy as an exploited "periphery." At the same time this indication cannot be determining if we examine the place and role of the group of developing countries in the world revolutionary process or in international relations.

The place and role of the developing countries in the modern world are constantly increasing. Study of the regularities of their changes is a most important sphere of general historical research.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. "Material of the 25th CPSU Congress," Moscow, 1976, p 13.
2. As is known, certain former colonies and semicolonies have embarked on the path of socialist development as the result of victorious socialist revolutions; they are related to the socialist countries. The remaining former colonies and semicolonies--the vast majority--are either developing in accordance with the capitalist path or as a result of national-democratic revolutions have opted for a socialist orientation; it has become accepted practice to term all of them "emancipated" or "developing." We do not employ these terms in respect of the former colonies and semicolonies which have become a part of the world socialist system.
3. "Twentysecond CPSU Congress," stenographic report, Moscow, 1962, p 260.
4. See "Zarubezhnyy Vostok i sovremennost'" [The Foreign East and the Present Day], Tashkent, Irkutsk, Moscow, 1974, p 13-14.

5. "Razvivayushchiyesya stran: zakonovernosti, tendentsii, perspektivy" [The Developing Countries: Regularities, Trends, Prospects], Moscow, 1974.
6. S.I. Tyul'panov, "Ocherki politicheskoy ekonomii. Razvivayushchiyesya strany" [Essays in Political Economy. The Developing Countries], Moscow, 1969, p 7.
7. V. Sheynis, "Socioeconomic Differentiation and Problems of a Typology of the Developing Countries," *MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA*, 1978, No 8, pp 97-103.
8. V.L. Sheynis mainly considers these features the "nucleus of the problem of dependence" (V. Sheynis, op. cit., p 101).
9. "Material of the 25th CPSU Congress," p 13.
10. See "Razvivayushchiyesya strany: zakonovernosti, tendentsii, perspektivy," pp 45-50, 74-75 and others.
11. R.A. Ul'yanovskiy, "Common Patterns of Socioeconomic Development and the Problem of the Specific Features of the Oriental Countries," *NOVAYA I NOVEYSHAYA ISTORIYA* No 3, 1978, p 51.
12. The author is aware that this is a "rectified trend"; this regularity may also not operate in certain stretches of time.
13. "Tipologiya nesotsialisticheskikh stran (Opyt mnogomerno-statisticheskogo analiza narodnykh khozyaystv)" [A Typology of the Nonsocialist Countries (Experience of a Multiple-Statistical Analysis of National Economies)], Moscow, 1976.

COPYRIGHT: "Narody Azii i Afriki", 1980

8850

CSO: 1807



## REGIONAL

### TURKMEN SCORES U.S. NEOCOLONIALISM

Ashkhabad TURKMENSKAYA ISKRA in Russian 13 Dec 80 p 3

[Article by N. Yermoshkin, candidate in history: "The Opium of Neocolonialism"]

[Text] The struggle against colonialism in the field of culture does not have a long history. The young states which began to appear on the political map of the world as a result of the collapse of the shameful colonialist system have only in the last decade come to learn that the so-called Western mass culture is a powerful instrument of present-day neocolonialism. And today the teletypes of the Western news agencies often serve the very same goals which were served by gunboats during the time of imperialism. In connection with this, the French researcher E. Bourges noted: "Freedom of the press, as it is understood in the West, as applied to the developing countries, means nothing else but the freedom of the rich--those who have money--to control the information media and force the poor to keep quiet."

Naturally, the developing countries do speak out against the West's dominance in their spiritual life. In UNESCO, at international forums, and within the framework of the non-alignment movement they pose the question of protecting the originality of the national cultures, for, as the Indian publicist D. Mankekar has emphasized, it is easier to restore a polluted countryside than to restore a polluted culture.

\* \* \*

Mark Twain, the great American satirist, wrote a hundred years ago with his inherent sarcasm that there were only two sources of light in the world: the sun in the heavens and the Associated Press on earth. In our own day this giant of imperialist information disseminates, together with United Press International, the British Reuters, and France Presse about 40 million words of news every day.

In fact, these trans-national corporations have seized a monopoly on the dissemination of information in the capitalist world. As a result, the flood of information from New York, London, and Paris exceeds one hundred-fold the news coming from Africa, Asia, and Latin America, where two-thirds of mankind lives.

In addition to this foursome, other large bourgeois press organs disseminate propagandistic materials; the NEW YORK TIMES, the LOS ANGELES TIMES, and the WASHINGTON POST, for example, every day provide newspapers and journals of 40 of the world's countries with articles which are ready-made for publication and which are politically and ideologically guiding in their nature. Similar "services" are rendered by the London TIMES and the Paris MONDE. Distributed in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America are such widespread American publications as READER'S DIGEST, which is published in 13 languages with a gigantic circulation of 23 million, the weekly publications NEWSWEEK, TIME, the British ECONOMIST, and others. All these powerful propaganda levers, being in the hands of the Western publishers, provide them with an opportunity to impose their own interpretation on world events, and they use this, in the words of V.I. Lenin, "to fabricate and falsify a so-called public opinion." The most tendentious selection of news determines the picture of the world, and an information policy advantageous to imperialism has been formed for the national press, as well as radio and television broadcasting. This is manifested particularly in the illumination of international life. In connection with this, A.L. Kosta, the director of the journal AFRIQUE NOUVELLE (Senegal) noted the following: "The African press is an appendage of one or several large international news agencies which control the press agencies, photo services, motion pictures, publishing houses, and advertising, designed to impose ... 'cultural imperialism,' which undermines the consciousness of people."

An analogous situation has also taken shape in the publishing sphere. The monopolies of the leading capitalist countries which are engaged in the publication and dissemination of printed output in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, inundate them with publications (including textbooks as well) which praise the bourgeois culture and standards of social values.

According to incomplete data, in the book markets of these states American publishing houses receive 300 million dollars every year for their output. Latin America has been divided up into personal patrimonies by certain groups of U.S. book publishers. The Hearst Corporation alone annually disseminates more than 15 million copies of books, comics, all manner of self-instruction books, and other output.

What does this "spiritual nourishment" consist of? The Indian literary scholar, Dr. Sudhesh, writes as follows in the newspaper JAN YUG [?]: "This is either a prescription of how to make money by swindling, or, what is even more frequent, the adventures and capture of Eastern European spies. From whatever point of view they are evaluated--from the point of view of contents, inspiration, language, form, innovation, or purpose,--these works of 'mass culture' are completely devoid of any qualities inherent in genuine literature and art."

\* \* \*

Even more sinister seems the dominance of the Western information services over the radio and television of the young countries. Here the proportion of imported broadcasts reaches as much as 90 percent, for to this day a number of the liberated states are experiencing an acute shortage of television and radio equipment, personnel, and financial means. They are compelled to import equipment and personnel, thus becoming an object of political and ideological expansion. That is the way it happened, for example, in Sri Lanka, where recently, with the help of Western and Japanese specialists, television broadcasting was inaugurated.

American television programs are viewed outside the borders of the United States by 65 million people. The annual totals of that country's television companies show sales and distribution to more than 130 of the world's states of materials amounting to 180,000 hours of broadcasting. The international markets are literally inundated with items of Western television production. These include detective serial motion pictures, musical and educational programs. In a seductive manner they propagandize bourgeois ideology and morality from Asian, African, and Latin American television screens. The views of consumer demand are instilled in the public, and false social criteria of justice, liberty, and prosperity are imposed. The dependence of the television of certain developing countries on the West has been strengthened even further with the appearance of programs which are transmitted by means of American communications satellites. Moreover, this is sometimes done without any kind of agreement from the local authorities.

Revenues from the sale of the output of Western private television companies have reached an impressive total, although they are sometimes sold at purely symbolic prices. An hour-long television film which has cost Hollywood 400--500,000 dollars to make is offered to Egyptian television for a rental fee of 400--500 dollars, to Lebanese television for 170--250 dollars, etc. Naturally, such rock-bottom prices lead to a situation whereby the television of the young states abandon the outlays required to create their own programs, which are more expensive. Needless to say, in the final analysis, this leads to an increased dependence on the foreign "merchants of illusions."

In his report "On Radio Broadcasting Abroad" the President of the United States called the system of radio broadcasting abroad one of the key elements of American foreign policy. Hence there are no regrets about spending money to advertise American capitalism. The U.S. government outlays for propaganda amount to several billion dollar per year.

Large-scale ideological expansion in the air waves is carried on by the Voice of America, which has at its disposal more than 100 transmitters, broadcasting for 816 hours a week in 37 of the world's languages. Nor is the field left to the American "Voice" by the British BBC and the French foreign broadcasting service to Africa. They have filled the air waves over the African and Asian continents. Only 10 percent of the radio frequencies belong to the 120 Asian, African, and Latin American countries.

A special place in the West's ideological offensive on the developing countries is allocated to the productions of the motion-picture industry. "Motion pictures travel all over the world," wrote the American producer and director, Darryl Zanuck, "reaching with equal success the educated and the illiterate, people in government as well as those outside of government who create public opinion." The world-renowned motion-picture firm Walt Disney Productions has estimated that 100 million persons see one Disney film a week, 800 million read one Disney book or magazine, 50 million listen to Disney records or dance to Disney music, and 150 million look at Disney comics. Via the means of this entire multi-faceted network, directed from a single center, one thought is persistently conveyed: "Here is a world for you which is unaware of any social conflicts." Disneyland and Disney Productions serve as a textbook example of the interweaving into a single ball of business, ideology, and entertainment. United in this modern conglomerate are large companies, research centers, publishing houses, and a system of distribution which produces and disseminates motion pictures, books, and television programs, i.e., the complete assortment of Western "canned goods" with their spiritual poison.

\* \* \*

All of imperialism's "cultural" activity is based on the concept of the "free flow of information." An analysis of this indicates that the fundamental goals of imperialist propaganda in the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America may be defined in the following manner: economic--to popularize private enterprise and to justify maintaining the economic dependence of the liberated states on the imperialist powers; political--to undermine the prestige of the socialist countries, to isolate the developing states from them; ideological--to implant the bourgeois ideology here, to neutralize the ideas of scientific socialism with the aid of unbridled anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

Without shrinking from crude slander and direct falsifications, capitalist propaganda has had broad recourse to veiled methods. In particular, in their radio broadcasts to the developing countries, the Voice of America and the BBC carefully avoid such topics as the exploitation by the imperialist monopolies of the natural and human resources of the developing countries, criticism aimed at these monopolies, and the support by the imperialist powers of anti-popular dictatorships and racist regimes in the zone of the liberation movement. Moreover, an attempt is made to create an atmosphere of confidential trust on the part of the audience according to the principle of: "We're your own kind of people; nothing divides us." This simple "package" includes any ideas advantageous to capitalism. In addressing listeners in Africa, the Near East, and Asia, the commentators of the Voice of America or the BBC "deferentially" expand upon the "well-known Eastern wisdom," which, of course, would not allow the peoples of these continents to enter upon the "dangerous and adventuristic" path of radical socioeconomic changes, including the nationalization of property belonging to foreign monopolies.



These propaganda organs also make intensive use of the so-called method of generalization. It is called upon to introduce into the consciousness of the population of the developing states ideas which are supposed to characterize the capitalist system, such as the "universal welfare state," the "free world," the society of "equal opportunities," the "society which respects human rights," and so forth. As regards the socialist world, in order to characterize it, use is made of such stereotyped expressions as the "iron curtain," "totalitarian state," "closed society," "red menace," that is, everything is done in order to evoke among the listeners a feeling of warning, of fear, and hatred toward socialism, to impose upon them a false idea about the living conditions in a socialist society.

Western propaganda methodically and persistently poisons the class consciousness of its Latin American, African, and Asian audiences, heating up nationalistic attitudes; it affects their way of life and norms of behavior; it emasculates those spiritual values in which the peoples of the East are rich; and it forms consumer-demand tendencies in society.

All this is explained by the fact that under the present circumstances imperialism cannot count on success by openly proclaiming its genuine goals. It is compelled to create an entire system of ideological myths which obscure the true meaning of its intentions, lulling the vigilance of the peoples.

"The Soviet people," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted, "have an understanding and sympathetic attitude toward the strivings of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to create their own organs of information, to protect themselves against the ideological expansion of imperialism, and to put an end to "spiritual colonialism."

There is no doubt that the developing countries, which have chosen a free, independent path of development, are defending their own sovereign rights not only in the fields of economics and politics but also in the sphere of spiritual life.

2384  
CSO: 1800

## REGIONAL

### KAZAKH JOURNALIST ON SOVIET-FINNISH FRIENDSHIP

Alma-Ata SOTSIALISTIK QAZAQSTAN in Kazakh 23 Dec 80 p 4

[Interview with USSR people's artist Ermek Serkebaev: "Cultural Joy"]

[Text] The year 1980, now almost at an end, was a productive one for Kazakh culture. Selected Kazakh artists were able to leave behind, in foreign lands, a fine impression of the achievements of Soviet art. One of the successful events of this sort was the tour of a group of representatives of the Kazakh arts in Finland.

USSR people's artist Ermek Serkebaev has reported in detail on this artistic event in a newspaper interview:

"Finland is one of the nations that first took advantage of the material and spiritual fruits yielded by a policy of peace and cooperation with the Soviet Union." Thus, L. I. Brezhnev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and president of the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, expressing the high regard the Soviet Union holds for Finland's peaceful foreign policy and its role in reducing tensions in Europe, evaluated the suitable manifestation of this in the domain of cultural relations on the occasion of a friendship visit of Urko Kekkonen, president of fraternal Finland, to our country. Our tour in Finland is another proof of this friendship.

The artistic events of the present year, just in time for the beginning of the traditional Soviet-Finnish Friendship Month, and in connection with the noteworthy event mentioned above, must be considered above all, as giving the tour of Kazakh master artists a special character. We may say that during each of 37 concerts given over the period of a month we gained the warm regard and respect of the Finnish people. In the group headed by Q. Sauvdabaev, vice-director of the Kazakhstan SSR Ministry of Culture, were USSR peoples artis Ramazan Bapov, the officially recognized republic artists Alibek Dinishev, Zarema Qasteeva, Qorlan Qalilambekova, Qalampir Rakhimova, Sultaghalı Shukorov and Sara Qabighojina, the dombra player Qarshigha Akhmediyarov, the qobiz player Ghaliya Toqtibaeva and various other musical performers.

In my view the concerts during the tour, which began in the city of (Rekhiyaki) located in the southern part of Finland, exceeded our expectations in some ways. The quiet mannered Finnish people, steeled by the harsh living conditions of the north, seemed to receive the staid and mysterious sounds of Kazakh music with

open hearts. In particular, we were surprised by how well the listeners appreciated pieces played on the national instruments, the dombra and qobiz. The high praises in the Finnish press for qobiz pieces played by Chaliya Toqtibaeva and dombra pieces played by Qarshigha Akhmediyarov were a joy for us all. The Finns deeply understand and highly value classical music and dance. Dance numbers of USSR people's artist Ramazan Bapov and Zarema Qasteeva were especially applauded. The magic show of Sultaghali Shukorov and Sara Qabighojina, the well known "here is the world of magic" act in particular, were written up in the Finnish papers not only in terms of the technical abilities of the Kazakh master artists, but also in terms of their superior conception. As is known, there were no newspapers published in all of Finland at the end of our tour. Finnish typographers went on strike. To be sure, such artistic displays in a country with a different social system will have a definite impact on the consolidation of the reputation of the representatives of Soviet arts and on the development of their abilities.

We met with the public in almost 20 cities and talked about the Soviet Union and Soviet Kazakhstan and its economic and cultural development. Before a few of the concerts representatives of the people gave some rather good lectures on Kazakhstan. Concerts went on longer than planned in programs in the cities of Helsinki, (Rekhimiyaki), Turku, Tampera, (Kauvkhayoki), (Ioensuvv) and (Yamsa), Finnish television news programs were devoted to the art of Kazakh master artists on the occasion of tour appearances, there were high praises in the press and, most of all, the common people whom we met acquired more information on our people and homeland and straightened out their misunderstandings. All of this shows, in my view, that the small group of artists completely fulfilled tasks set before it. We may be satisfied with the contribution that we have made, with our own native abilities, in increasing the joy of our national culture.

11,433  
CSO: 1810

## REGIONAL

### TAJIKS COMPLAIN ABOUT LIVING CONDITIONS

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Nov 80 p 2

[Interview with R. Khodshiyev, first secretary of the Leninabad Obkom of the Communist Party of Tajikistan, by L. Kurin and O. Latifi, special correspondents]

[Text] R. Khodshiyev, First Secretary of the Leninabad Obkom of the Communist Party of Tajikistan Comments on PRAVDA's Mail

This year PRAVDA has received many letters from Leninabadskaya Oblast. The questions in them are varied. Trade and public dining, everyday and municipal services, labor conflicts, social insurance, health care, communications, transportation, housing conditions, environmental protection. . . in short, everything which affects people on a daily basis. Each complaint is individual in its nature, caused by a specific reason. But there are also general, very characteristic reasons. How to reveal them and eliminate them, utilizing for this purpose the force of public opinion as well as the justice of the laws--such is the fundamental theme of the commentary presented below.

[Question] If you have no objection, Rif"at Khodshievich, let's begin with a question which, at first glance, seems general but which is essential: Where are the complaints coming from and what are their primary reasons?

[Answer] Before answering your question directly, let me cite the following episode. As you know, it wasn't so long ago that classes began in the system of political education. The Partkom of the Leninabad Silk Combine asked me to deliver the introductory lecture for the participants in a seminar. This is the leading light industrial enterprise in our republic.

And so, when my lecture had come to an end, I asked, as usual; "Are there any questions?" They posed two questions--regarding the international situation. I answered them. And again I addressed the hall: "Perhaps you have some statements, suggestions, complaints about everyday conditions, facilities, or housing?" At this point I should tell you that the combine still has a long waiting line for suitable apartments, and there is a shortage of kindergartens and nurseries. But no one raised their hand nor sent up any notes. The thought occurred to me: "They are probably shy in this large audience." After the lecture I talked with



these women workers. One of them told me directly: "Yes, the housing situation is difficult here. Not all the mothers can bring their children to kindergarten: there are not enough places. And you can't always buy meat in the store. Of course, this disturbs us. But this isn't anybody's fault, there simply are difficulties. And we are overcoming them. If only there were peace in the world...." This was said simply and wisely. And if a rank-and-file woman worker speaks this way, it means that she understands well that the prosperity of the people depends on her personal work.

The meeting about which I'm speaking occurred prior to the October Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. It is noteworthy that the words of the woman worker are consonant in spirit with the positions and conclusions which were taken at the Plenum. This testifies to the fact that in its decisions the party relies on the opinion of the wide masses of workers. I want to remind you of the words of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, which he uttered in his speech at this Plenum: "An attentive concerned attitude toward people must permeate the entire style of work by party, Soviet and economic organs, and, of course, by trade unions. Such an attitude must become an inalienable trait of the work of every leader--large or small."

In glancing over the letters which you have shown me, I can't help noting that many of the complaints were caused by defects in the style and operating methods of organizations and departments or of individual officials.

Let's take such an acute problem as guaranteeing suitable housing. Of course, the main way to solve this problem is to have a high rate of housing construction. As noted in the Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, these rates have also been retained in the 11th Five-Year Plan. However, if public control over the quality of housing construction and the proper distribution of apartments were well established everywhere, there would be considerably less complaint.

Housing is an important social question. The party obkom is continually concerned with it. No deviation from the norm nor departure from the regulations should escape the attention of the party committees. Recently, for example, at a session of the obkom bureau we considered a letter from an excavator operator of the Leninabadvodstroy Trust, N. Shepelev. He had written to the obkom that the sequential order of acquiring housing was being grossly violated in the trust. After attentively examining this signal from a worker, we punished the guilty persons involved. The manager of the trust, the Communist Comrade Yuldashev received a strict reprimand and an entry on his registration card.

At times complaints are caused by a lack of forethought or by lax discipline. Because of these, let's say, pensioners may be settled on the fifth floor of an apartment house which has no elevator. And young people may be given apartments on the first floor. Sluggishness and procrastination may lead in turn to red tape, which because of some petty trifle sometimes lasts for years.

Question/ You are familiar with the letter from the inhabitants of one of the Leninabad apartment houses. In the story which they describe bureaucratism was at fault. Would you care to comment on this fact?

[Answer] The apartment house in question was turned over for occupancy in May 1976 with bad roofing. It leaked. The roof should have been fixed right away-- and that would have been an end to the matter. However, events unfolded differently. On several occasions the inhabitants directed complaints to the Housing-Operations Section No 6, and to the operations-housing trust of the gorispolkom. There at first they brushed aside these justifiable but unfavorable criticisms. Later, however, they did decide to fix the roof. But the repairs were carried out in a haphazard manner and the roof leaked again. This matter was exacerbated by the fact that an illuminated advertisement was installed on top of the apartment house. Under these conditions the roof wore through. The people wrote letters, wore down the thresholds of the housing-operations section, the trust, the gorispolkom.... After persistent requests the gorispolkom created a commission consisting of six persons. This commission drew up an act. The latter set forth what everybody had known for a long time: it was necessary to take the advertisement down from the house and to fix the roof. But even this act remained a good intention. And so now this letter has appeared in the editor's office....

The Leninabad Party Gorkom has looked into this irritating matter. The roof was repaired within a few days, but the red tape and procrastination had lasted four years. Those guilty have been given their just desserts. R. Saidov, the chief of the department of complaints and declarations of the gorispolkom, has been dismissed from his position.

In connection with this case, I should say that at times we talk a great deal about bureaucratism in general and on the whole, while forgetting that behind it there always stand individual officials. The more strictly they are held accountable for their transgressions, the sooner we will extricate ourselves from a vestige which has no place in our society. Where it is a question of the worthiness of Soviet man, of satisfying his legitimate interests, there is a particular demand upon all state and economic organs, as well as upon all officials.

Let me reinforce this firm position by selecting yet another letter. It talks about Kh. Rakhimov, the chairman of a kolkhoz in the Pendzhikentskiy Rayon. He was systematically violating financial discipline and misusing his official position. The kolkhoz members grew indignant: why was such a person in charge of a farm? At first the Pendzhikentskiy Party Gorkom administered a severe reprimand to Kh. Rakhimov and made an entry on his registration card. But he was kept in his managerial position. The chairman drew no conclusions at all from his punishment and was soon up to his old tricks again. In 1978 he received a second severe reprimand. But again he remained at the head of the kolkhoz administration. It is not surprising that this evoked a new flood of complaints. The party oblast committee was compelled to intervene. Kh. Rakhimov was removed from the farm's leadership.

How can one comment on this case? The party has steadfastly affirmed a careful, concerned attitude toward personnel. However, trust and respect for people must be combined with a high level of requirements for the cause entrusted to them. We cannot leave in managerial work those who have demonstrated a lack of responsibility, alienated themselves from the masses, violated party and state discipline, and by their behavior have discredited the calling of leader.

[Question] The editorial offices of the central newspapers receive quite a few letters with questions which could and should be solved in the locality. Why, in your opinion, does this occur?

[Answer] The incompetence of individual local party, Soviet, and economic organs--is yet another source of complaints. We also feel this in the obkom's mail. And there are many letters which are sent on to us by higher organs, as well as the editorial offices of newspapers and journals. The reasons are varied. Also in evidence here is the lack of responsibility which we spoke about earlier and the simple inability to solve this or that problem on the spot. And so we need to increase the responsibility of all ranks of officials and teach them. Teach them not only in all kinds of seminars and conferences in the oblast center but also directly in the kishlaks [Central Asian villages], settlements, and rayon centers. It is becoming an everyday practice among us to have meetings between the chiefs of oblast organizations and people in the places where they live. They are organized, as a rule, within the framework of an integrated political day--on the third Friday of every month. Taking part in them are the secretaries and section chiefs of the party obkoms and raykoms and chiefs of the oblast administrations. These management personnel answer questions and, insofar as possible, outline measures, deadlines, and the responsible persons in order to rectify shortcomings and omissions, as well as to solve this or that problem.

Such meetings, even though they are not conducted formally, do bring undoubted benefits. In the first place, people receive the necessary explanations, doubts are resolved, and there is no longer any need to write to the oblast center, Dushanbe, or Moscow. Let me refer to another example here. After a "round-table" conversation in one of the residential quarters of the city of Leninabad construction on a chaykhana [tea-house] was speeded up, another newspaper kiosk was opened, and there was no more negative criticism by inhabitants about the late mail delivery of newspapers and journals.... In the second place, at such meetings the oblast and rayon personnel can learn from the confidential and frank conversation about urgent topics. I know from my own experience that this is not always such a simple matter.

After the 25th Party Congress, and especially after the well-known decree of the CPSU Central Committee concerning further improvements in work with the written and oral communications of citizens, the party obkom increased its demand for work with letters. In 1980 alone sessions of the obkom bureau and secretariat listened to reports on this topic by the Kanibadamskiy Gorkom, the Zafarobodskiy and Ganchinskiy Party Raykoms, the editors of the newspaper LENINABADSKAYA PRAVDA, oblast administrations of internal affairs, as well as municipal public services, the oblast council of trade unions, and the oblispolkom department of justice.

Similar discussions are taking place under business-like, exacting conditions. They teach people to have a more responsible attitude toward letters and statements from workers, to consider them with a knowledge of the matter at hand, to analyze and eliminate the causes of the complaints. In short, we are trying to bring it about that a concerned attitude toward people becomes an inalienable trait of the work style of every party organization and of every institution.

## REGIONAL

### ASPECTS OF YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROBLEM IN UKRAINE

Kiev RADYANS'KA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 4 Dec 80 p 2

[Article by A. Tyutyunnikov, head of Department of Youth Employment and Professional Orientation, Ukr SSR State Committee for Labor: "If the Heart is Put into the Matter"]

[Text] In present-day conditions, the improvement in professional orientation, worker instruction and the education of youth is becoming an ever more important factor in rational division and utilization of worker resources, dynamic and balanced development of economy, in the rise of production effectiveness and work quality.

In the outline of Basic Directions for USSR Economic and Social Development considerable attention is given to issues dealing with the improvement of personnel preparation for national economy and their rational utilization.

The preparation of a new contingent for the national economy is a responsible and very complex matter. Highly qualified specialists, skilled in their area are born where work with young people is approached in all seriousness with the inclusion of all possible interested sides. It should be noted also that one of the most important conditions for popular production intensification is the more rational and economic utilization of young workers.

The young people -- are a special group of worker resources characterized by the highest working capacity, increased mobility, a high level of general education and orientation towards high ideals. There are specific requirements then as to youth work content, its organization, presence of an essential psychological climate and possibilities for creative professional growth.

Some positive results of work with youth are generally known: the production association "Foton", machine factory "Santekhprom" in Krymskaya Oblast, Dneprodzerzhynsk sewing factory imeni Chubay, "Zhdanovtyazhmash", Krivorog metallurgical plant imeni Lenin, Dniprovsk machine building factory, production association "Melitopol'kholodmash" and many others.

An outstanding characteristic of above named enterprises is the creation of essential production and living conditions for young people and the solution of problems related to adaptation and retaining young workers in production.



Of course the many positive facts are interesting and instructive but, unfortunately, there are many of those which do not make us happy and elicit an understandable concern.

For example, at the Rovenskiy factory of industrial sewing and clothing repair "Polisyanka", and the Brovarskiy woodworking production association, little attention is paid to new employees. Young workers are poorly equipped with technology at the Kremenchug shoe factory and Tokmakskiy factory imeni Kirov with instruments. Or, let's say a school graduate came to the "Uzhhorodprylad" factory, Odessa sewing production association or Cherkassy silk combine and is told: "Find housing by yourself." Quite naturally not many will stay long at such an enterprise.

A very high turnover among secondary and trade school graduates may be found at the "Vinnytsyaprombud" combine, the building-construction administration "Oporyadbud", "Mykolayivzhytlobud" trust and at the Poltava wagon repair plant. One of the reasons is that appropriate conditions for professional growth are not created for the young workers.

The influx of young people into popular production is especially influenced by the patronage of enterprises, organizations and farms over schools and vocational trade schools. Of course, this patronage is only informal. For example, the Zhitomir factory of automatic machine tools was patron to secondary school no. 20. But there are hardly any graduates going to work at "their" enterprise. I think it can be explained mainly by the fact that the students aren't interested in professions needed by the factory. Factory patronage assistance consisted mainly of providing help in school renovation and acquisition of visual equipment. Of course, there is no benefit from this type of "professional orientation".

The fact that some young people do not work or study for a long time also causes serious concern. According to teaching institution data last year several thousand people left schools. Most of them soon became employed. However, a specific portion of this contingent of young people leaves our field of vision for a while.

The number of unemployed young people in popular production periodically rises because of dismissal from production without the knowledge and permission of special commissions for underage problems. And so having a working record calculated on the basis of a few working days, often without having received a service record, these young people wander along backyards, streets and nooks looking for ways to use up their unspent strength, and often direct the excess of their energy to far from beneficial matters.

This can also be explained by the insufficient general and trade school professional orientation level, uncoordinated activity of labor organs with Komsomol committees, pedagogues, community organizations and MVD organs.

In each oblast, city and rayon there are enterprises, buildings, kolkhozes and sovkhoses which have accumulated extensive positive experience in professional orientation, employment and retaining of young people in worker collectives. Positive results of this type of work with youth are familiar all over the Union, especially at "KhTZ" [Kharkivskiy Tekhnichnyy Zavod?], Dneprovskiy machine building

factory, Kiev production association imeni S. Korol'ov, on farms in Radekhivskiy Rayon, Lvovskaya Oblast and many others. Unfortunately, this experience is being introduced rather slowly.

Youth and factory papers, radio and television programs do not describe leading industrial, agricultural and construction professions often enough. Enterprise, organization and farm managers should not consider professional publicity beneath them and should speak out in the press, on television and radio, should talk to young people about their future and profession selection; they should be concerned with keeping the young people starting out in production, create favorable conditions for their professional growth, for an all around development, and an increase in the general educational level.

The strongest work stimulus is provided by an understanding of its social meaning, and a love for one's profession. The satisfaction and joy from a well done job increase the individual's creative potential immensely. This, then, provides the first task for worker collectives -- to help the young people select a profession or specialty which would be most suited to their abilities and inclinations, would assure a combination of personal interests with the interests of society. An effort should be made to make each young person understand that if he chooses something of real interest to him and puts his heart into it, happiness will definitely find him.

9443  
CSO: 1811

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

Feb. 4 1981